

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

H. R. 9040

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 6, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Arizona introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

A BILL

To authorize cooperative research in education.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That in order to enable the Office of Education more effec-
4 tively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties
5 for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of
6 Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly
7 financed cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges,
8 and State educational departments for the conduct of research,
9 surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.

10 SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
11 annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health,
12 Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress deter-
13 mines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

83^d CONGRESS
2^d SESSION

H. R. 9040

A BILL

To authorize cooperative research in education.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona

MAY 6, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

AUTHORIZING COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

MAY 7, 1954.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. McCONNELL, from the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 9040]

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

In order to strengthen educational services and facilities, this bill authorizes the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to make arrangements with universities, colleges and State educational departments for joint studies of the problems of American education.

At the present time the Office of Education has no legislative authority to enter into contracts for jointly financed research projects with colleges, universities, and State educational departments which are trying to solve educational problems. The prime advantage of cooperative research work with these organizations in the field of education is that such procedure makes full use of existing facilities and avoids the centralization of staff and facilities in Washington. The same procedure has been followed in the field of public health, for example, and has resulted in notable improvements and great returns for each Federal dollar spent.

METHOD OF OPERATION

In carrying out the provisions of this bill, the Office of Education will receive applications for Federal assistance from universities, colleges, and State educational departments in order to carry on research work which would be valuable to school districts throughout

the country. The applications will be carefully studied and selections made on the basis of importance and value of the projects to the largest number of educational groups that will benefit from the results. After the "allotment" or "grant" is made, the Office of Education will not exercise any control or direction over the university, college, or State educational department other than the normal procedures followed in insuring that the terms of a contract are properly carried out. The results of the project will be made available to educational agencies throughout the country. Utilization of the findings will, of course, be made by school systems on a purely voluntary basis.

General practice with respect to educational research today usually involves study of local problems by those directly concerned at the local level. This procedure is sometimes wasteful because many matters of local concern are, in fact, common to other localities across our Nation. Too often only those concerned locally profit from their research. A more efficient procedure would involve enlarging the scope of a local or State study so as to make its findings usable by others in other regions. For example, Minnesota may be studying more effective utilization of the services of teachers. Many other States may share the same general concern, but the particulars of their respective problems may be sufficiently different to render the Minnesota findings inapplicable for their purposes. This bill would make possible contributions of funds from the Office of Education in order to enlarge the scope of the study so as to make the findings more widely useful.

This method of carrying on research in the field of education will stimulate studies of the most pressing problems, provide benefits for a larger number of schools and make each dollar spent by the Federal Government go further.

EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH STUDIES

There are many areas in the field of education in which cooperative research holds out great promise for increased economy and efficiency. Some examples of studies which might be undertaken under this cooperative research program are as follows:

- (a) Reducing the cost of educational facilities.
- (b) Improving business procedures in schools and colleges.
- (c) Reorganizing school districts for maximum efficiency.
- (d) Attracting more young people into teaching, engineering, and other "shortage" professions.
- (e) Improving teaching methods.
- (f) Developing closer ties with parents and citizens.
- (g) Placing community health and social agencies in proper perspective with school programs.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 2 of the bill authorizes to be appropriated annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Department has indicated that it plans to begin with a request of \$100,000 for the first year.

H. R. 9040

[Report No. 1565]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 6, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Arizona introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

MAY 7, 1954

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To authorize cooperative research in education.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That in order to enable the Office of Education more effec-
4 tively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties
5 for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of
6 Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly
7 financed cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges,
8 and State educational departments for the conduct of research,
9 surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.

10 SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
11 annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health,
12 Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress deter-
13 mines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

83^d CONGRESS
2^d Session

H. R. 9040

[Report No. 1565]

A BILL

To authorize cooperative research in education.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona

MAY 6, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

MAY 7, 1954

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

May 13, 1954
May 12, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 87

CONTENTS

Agriculture Yearbook.....4	Fisheries.....11	Raisins.....3
Animal diseases.....9	Flammable fabrics.....6	Reclamation.....16
Appropriations.....9,11	Foreign aid.....19	Research.....2
Claims.....14	Grain.....10	REA.....7
Contracts.....12	Legislative program.....11	Soil conservation.....5
Dairy industry.....8,17	Livestock.....18	Taxation.....5
Education.....2	Loans, farm.....11	TVA.....20
Electrification.....7,20	Marketing.....15,18	Transportation.....10
Farm-income insurance...13	Personnel.....14	Wheat.....19
Farm program.....1	Prices, support.....1,8,17	

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee announced plans to draft omnibus farm-program bill. Senate debated bill to expedite ICC rate decisions. Sen. Young spoke favoring Agriculture Yearbook. Sen. Frear introduced and discussed bill to insure farm incomes against certain losses. Sen. Johnston (S.C.) introduced bill for Federal pay increases.

HOUSE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Following an executive meeting of the Agriculture Committee, Chairman Hope made the following statement: "The committee met for the purpose of discussing the matter of a general farm bill, and a motion was made to have the committee begin work on an omnibus bill, without any decision having been reached with regard to what subjects are to be included in the general farm bill and without any vote on what subjects are to be included in the bill. The staff was instructed to prepare and report to the committee, at a later date, a summary of subjects and titles that might be included in the omnibus bill, as well as any other subjects that have been considered and discussed in our hearings and are properly before the committee at this time, in the nature of a farm program. The committee agreed that the bill would cover a number of subjects without any decision as to what subjects are to be included." (p. D517.)

2. EDUCATION. Passed, 296-55, with amendment H. R. 9040, to authorize cooperative research in education (pp. 6112-30).

Began debate on H. R. 7434, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education (pp. 6130-6).

3. RAISINS. Rep. Hunter spoke in commemoration of National Raisin Week (p. 6105).

SENATE

4. AGRICULTURE YEARBOOK. Sen. Young spoke favoring continuation of the Agriculture Yearbook and inserted an article by A. D. Stedman (p. 6081).

5. SOIL CONSERVATION. During consideration of the general tax revision bill, H. R. 8300, the Finance Committee agreed to the House provision (Sec. 175) relating to expenditures for soil and water conservation, but made "certain technical amendments making it clear, for example, that the provision applies to earthen dams

not subject to depreciation and to the construction, as well as the control and protection, of watercourses, outlets, and ponds" (p. D514).

Foreign

6. FLAMMABLE FABRICS. The Interstate and Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 3379, to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act so as to exempt fabrics and wearing apparel not highly flammable (S. Rept. 1323)(p. 6079).
7. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Farmers Union local resolution favoring Federal power projects for benefit of REA cooperatives (p. 6078). He also inserted a local Rural Cooperative Power Association resolution favoring adequate REA funds (p. 6078).
8. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Brimson Cooperative Association resolution favoring 90% dairy supports (p. 6079).
9. ANIMAL DISEASES. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Minn. Tuberculosis and Health Assn. resolution opposing reduction of Federal appropriations for tuberculosis control (p. 6078).
10. TRANSPORTATION. Continued debate on S. 1461, to expedite ICC action upon applications of certain common carriers for rate increases, agreeing to all committee amendments and to Sen. Douglas' amendment to eliminate language which would have changed the basis of rate making so as to enable higher rates (pp. 6083-101). Sen. Aiken discussed with Sen. Bricker the trip-leasing bill, H. R. 3203, and urged action upon it (pp. 6099-100).
The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 602, to authorize the Treasury Department to prescribe safety rules for the loading, etc., of grain and other bulk cargoes (S. Rept. 1324)(p. 6079).
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Knowland announced that today, following disposition of the transportation bill, the Senate is expected to consider several bills, including the emergency farm loans proposal, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, and the surplus fish bill (p. 6083).

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

12. CONTRACTS. S. 24, to permit court review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged. Approved May 11, 1954 (Public Law 356, 83rd Cong.).

BILLS INTRODUCED

13. FARM-INCOME INSURANCE. S. 3442, by Sen. Frear, to stabilize farm incomes by providing a system of insurance to indemnify farmers against certain losses occurring in the operation of their farms; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 6079). Remarks of author (p. 6080).
14. PERSONNEL. S. 3443, by Sen. Johnston (for himself and others), to increase the pay of Federal employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 6079). H. R. 9107, by Rep. Barrett, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to consider certain claims for basic and overtime pay; to Judiciary Committee (p. 6143).

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. Section 22 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by inserting the words "offer or" before the word "sale" in the second sentence thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 7, line 12, strike "12" and insert "11."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED

SEC. 201. (d) of section 11 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended by striking out the words "six months" where they appear in such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the words "thirty days."

SEC. 202. The last sentence of paragraph (d) of section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 11, line 17, strike "Paragraph" and insert "Subsection."

Page 11, line 22, strike "paragraph" and insert "subsection."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TRUST INDENTURE ACT OF 1939

SEC. 301. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by deleting the words "as heretofore amended."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The terms 'sale', 'sell', 'offer to sell', 'offer for sale', and 'offer' shall include all transactions included in such terms as provided in paragraph (3) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, except that an offer or sale of a certificate of interest or participation shall be deemed an offer or sale of the security or securities in which such certificate evidences an interest or participation if and only if such certificate gives the holder thereof the right to convert the same into such security or securities."

(c) Paragraph (3) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'prospectus' shall have the meaning assigned to such term in paragraph (10) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, except that in the case of securities which are not registered under the Securities Act of 1933, such term shall not include any communication (A) if it is proved that prior to or at the same time with such communication a written statement if any required by section 306 was sent or given to the persons to whom the communication was made, or (B) if such communication states from whom such statement may be obtained (if such statement is required by rules or regulations under paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (b) of section 306) and, in addition, does no more than identify the security, state the price thereof, state by whom orders will be executed and contain such other information as the Commission, by rules or regulations deemed necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed therein, may permit."

(d) Paragraph (4) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by inserting the words "offers or" before the word "sells."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 12, line 5, strike out "words 'as heretofore amended'" and insert "following: 'as heretofore amended.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. Subsection (b) of section 304 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by deleting the words "as heretofore amended."

SEC. 303. Subsection (c) of section 305 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) A prospectus relating to any such security shall include to the extent the Commission may prescribe by rules and regulations as necessary and appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, as though such inclusion were required by section 10 of the Securities Act of 1933, a written statement containing the analysis set forth in the registration statement, of any indenture provisions with respect to the matters specified in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section, together with a supplementary analysis, prepared by the Commission, of such provisions and of the effect thereof, if, in the opinion of the Commission, the inclusion of such supplementary analysis is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, and the Commission so declares by order after notice and, if demanded by the issuer, opportunity for hearing thereon. Such order shall be entered prior to the effective date of registration, except that if opportunity for hearing thereon is demanded by the issuer such order shall be entered within a reasonable time after such opportunity for hearing."

SEC. 304. Section 306 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 306. (a) In the case of any security which is not registered under the Securities Act of 1933 and to which this subsection is applicable notwithstanding the provisions of section 304, unless such security has been or is to be issued under an indenture and an application for qualification is effective as to such indenture, it shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly—

"(1) to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to sell such security through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise; or

"(2) to carry or cause to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce, by any means or instruments of transportation, any such security for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale.

"(b) In the case of any security which is not registered under the Securities Act of 1933, but which has been or is to be issued under an indenture as to which an application for qualification is effective, it shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly—

"(1) to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to carry or transmit any prospectus relating to any such security, unless such prospectus, to the extent the Commission may prescribe by rules and regulations as necessary and appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, includes or is accompanied by a written statement that contains the information specified in subsection (c) of section 305; or

"(2) to carry or cause to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce any such security for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale, unless, to the extent the Commission may prescribe by rules and regulations as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, accompanied or preceded by a written statement that contains

the information specified subsection (c) of section 305.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to offer to sell through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise any security which is not registered under the Securities Act of 1933 and to which this subsection is applicable notwithstanding the provisions of section 304, unless such security has been or is to be issued under an indenture and an application for qualification has been filed as to such indenture, or while the application is the subject of a refusal order or stop order or (prior to qualification) any public proceeding or examination under section 307 (c)."

SEC. 305. Section 324 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by deleting the words "issuing or selling" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "offering, selling, or issuing."

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940

SEC. 401. Section 2 (a) (30) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended to read as follows:

"(30) 'Prospectus', as used in section 22, means a written prospectus intended to meet the requirements of section 10 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933 and currently in use. As used elsewhere, 'prospectus' means a prospectus as defined in the Securities Act of 1933."

SEC. 402. Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "The exemption provided by the third clause of section 4 (1) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to any transaction in a security issued by a face-amount certificate company or in a redeemable security issued by an open-end management company or unit investment trust, if any other security of the same class is currently being offered or sold by the issuer or by or through an underwriter in a distribution which is not exempted from section 5 of said act, except to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission, having due regard for the public interest and the protection of investors, may prescribe by rules or regulations with respect to any class of persons, securities, or transactions."

SEC. 403. Section 24 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) (1) A registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 relating to a security issued by a face-amount certificate company or a redeemable security issued by an open-end management company or unit investment trust may be amended after its effective date so as to increase the securities specified therein as proposed to be offered. At the time of filing such amendment there shall be paid to the Commission a fee, calculated in the manner specified in section 6 (b) of said act, with respect to the additional securities therein proposed to be offered.

"(2) The filing of such an amendment to a registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 shall not be deemed to have taken place unless it is accompanied by a United States postal money order or a certified bank check or cash for the amount of the fee required under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(3) For the purposes of section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the effective date of the latest amendment filed pursuant to this subsection or otherwise shall be deemed the effective date of the registration statement with respect to securities sold after such amendment shall have become effective. For the purposes of section

13 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, no such security shall be deemed to have been bona fide offered to the public prior to the effective date of the latest amendment filed pursuant to this subsection. Except to the extent the Commission otherwise provides by rules or regulations as appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, no prospectus relating to a security issued by a face-amount certificate company or a redeemable security issued by an open-end management company or unit investment trust which varies for the purposes of subsection (a) (3) of section 10 of the Securities Act of 1933 from the latest prospectus filed as a part of the registration statement shall be deemed to meet the requirements of said section 10 unless filed as part of an amendment to the registration statement under said act and such amendment has become effective."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 13, line 18, strike out "words 'as heretofore amended'" and insert "following: 'as heretofore amended,'."

Page 14, line 19, insert:

"SECURITIES NOT REGISTERED UNDER SECURITIES ACT"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Page 20, line 1, insert:

"TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 501. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BATES, of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2846) to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, pursuant to House Resolution 527, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 531 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education. After general debate, which shall

be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 531, which will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 9040, to authorize cooperative research in education.

House Resolution 531, Mr. Speaker, provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

As I understand this bill, Mr. Speaker, it would authorize the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to make arrangements with universities, colleges, and State educational departments for joint studies of the problems of American education.

According to the report on this bill, Mr. Speaker, the Office of Education at the present time has no legislative authority to enter into contracts for jointly financed research projects with the educational institutions throughout our country that are attempting to solve educational problems.

The committee report, Mr. Speaker, also brings out that if there is cooperative research work in the field of education, advantage will be taken of already existing facilities, and avoids what is personally abhorrent to me, the centralization of staff and facilities in Washington to the exclusion of local and State participation.

The method by which this legislation would function, Mr. Speaker, would be that the Office of Education would receive applications for Federal assistance from educational institutions throughout the Nation for the purpose of carrying on research work which would be valuable to school districts throughout the country.

The projects selected would be chosen on the basis of importance and value of the projects to the largest number of educational groups that will benefit from the results. It is important, I believe, that the House know that the Office of Education, after the selections have been made, does not exercise any control over the educational institution involved, other than insuring that the terms of the contract are being carried out, and, of course, the utilization of any findings by these research projects will be completely up to the individual school systems.

Mr. Speaker, when the members of the Committee on Education and Labor appeared before the Rules Committee on behalf of this bill, it was suggested that an amendment be made by the committee from the floor which would limit

the amount of money which could be authorized for any fiscal year in order to carry out the purposes of this bill. It is my understanding that the Committee on Education and Labor has agreed to and will offer such an amendment on this bill.

I think that this proposed amendment is a good thing, and that the bill itself deserves consideration. I hope that the rule will be adopted.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to in any way interfere with the adoption of this rule; however, I did want time, either in discussion on the rule or during general debate to make certain observations on this proposed legislation. I shall do nothing to interfere with its passage in the House except to call attention of my colleagues to the fact that the time for research and the time for talking in the field of education insofar as it applies to needed school facilities has long time passed. The time for action is at hand. If this is not to be considered in the nature of a delaying move or for the purpose of putting off consideration of the study of the need for school construction, then the matter is perfectly acceptable to the minority side of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I sometimes think, in fact I am convinced, that the Department of Education has sufficient information as the result of a survey made under title I of Public Law 815 which set up the need for school construction throughout the Nation. I noticed that in the testimony of Mrs. Hobby, head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, before the Senate committee yesterday, she acknowledged that those facts were known; that the national survey had shown the need for 340,000 classrooms as of September 1 last year. If this situation is not corrected by the 1st of September 1958, we will be short 600,000 classrooms. I like to think, facing it as I have faced it over the years, that it is a proposition that is beyond the ability of the local school districts in the case of 18 or 19 States to handle without some kind of Federal grant. Now, I am pleased to note that Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, has already opened hearings in the Senate, and I want to extend my congratulations to the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, who is presently setting up a subcommittee to take up consideration of legislation having to do with construction.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I might ask a question. Is it true that this bill on which a rule is requested merely provides for holding federally financed gabfest sessions throughout the United States, or so-called bull sessions?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, I would like to answer the gentleman from Georgia to say that no harm can come from further discussion of the problem of school con-

struction. I would not object to it on that ground, but I did make the observation that I thought the time for talk and conferences was past and the time for action was at hand.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the gentleman know of any real good that can come from these federally financed glorified bull sessions?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. I may even go so far as to say some good, but I do not want that to interfere with the action of the Congress that is necessary to improve what has become a national disgrace, and that is the neglect of our elementary and secondary school systems.

Mr. WHEELER. Is it not true that the information which will come out at these bull sessions is immediately available by simply contacting the offices of the school administrators at the State level?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, that is probably true. I will agree with the gentleman from Georgia that it could be secured there, because they have just finished a 2- or 3-year survey in their respective States setting up that information.

Mr. WHEELER. In other words, it is my opinion, if the gentleman will yield for an observation, that the passage of this legislation is an insult to the school administrators in every State of this Nation.

Mr. BAILEY. Let that stand as an observation by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the approval of this rule. I would just like to get across to my colleagues at this time that if there is one reason for my service over the past several years in the Congress and my continuation in the service over future years, it is my interest in the boys and the girls of this country, and I do not want to do anything that will interfere with proper attention being given by the Congress at the present time to this very serious situation: The need for additional schools.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire which, I assure the House, will not be very much.

I tried to follow my distinguished colleague from Illinois, the chairman of the committee [Mr. ALLEN], and the gentleman who followed him, Mr. BAILEY of West Virginia, as to what is the purpose of this bill. I also tried to get some conception of that when the matter was heard before the Committee on Rules. Like my friend from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], I do not want to do anything that would interfere in any way with the advancement in education, with the progress of the youth of this country. But I do not see how this is going to contribute anything substantial to that cause.

It would appear to one who had not had an opportunity to go into this matter any more than I have, that this means just the setting up of another commission, another piece of the bureaucracy that we have heard so much about. I do not see that it is going to contribute anything, as my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], pointed

out a few moments ago in his very pertinent questioning of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

I have not found any great enthusiasm for this bill. I do not know how much it is going to cost. We do know that we already owe a small matter of \$275 billion. I imagine another half a million on top of that may not break the country, but certainly it is not going to help the country and it is not going to help the status of the finances of the country to keep dribbling it out in unnecessary expenditures for bureaus and commissions such as is proposed here.

Mr. Speaker, we heard a great deal in previous years from this administration, that after it came into power, it was going to do away with a lot of the bureaucracy, a great many of the unnecessary commissions, and so forth. And I am all for that. I am in accord with what my friends on the right advocated then but I find I cannot always be in accord with what they are doing now.

I do not see that this is going to bring about any substantial result or contribute anything to the cause at which it seems to be vaguely aimed.

I should like to ask my friend from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, if he knows what this is ultimately going to cost.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, that will be determined by the Appropriations Committee when they bring in a bill here. I do not think it is going to cost very much.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman says he does not know, but he does not think it will cost very much. I wonder if he can give us any idea.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The cost will be determined by the committee ultimately and this body will have to approve whatever recommendation is made.

Mr. COLMER. I suppose I should not have asked my distinguished chairman such a question. Perhaps I should direct that question to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. Perhaps he would answer that question.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the bill has no provision for any ceiling. At the appropriate time I intend to offer an amendment providing that no more than \$400,000 in any fiscal year will be appropriated for the purposes set forth in this bill. In further answer to the question of the gentleman, though, it is my understanding that in the first year under this program approximately \$100,000 will be spent and that as the program develops it will get up perhaps to the point of \$400,000 but no higher than that.

Mr. COLMER. Then, if I understand the gentleman, we are going to spend \$100,000 the first year and then the program will be accelerated, as the years go on, and the gentleman hopes to limit the expenditure to \$400,000 a year.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course it will be limited by law if the amendment which I propose to submit to the committee is adopted. It will not be over \$400,000 a year. The gentleman realizes that when a program like this is starting it must learn to crawl before

it starts to run, so that naturally as it goes along it is going to be in a position to do more for education, and then we will have to spend more money.

Mr. COLMER. May I say to my distinguished young friend that that is exactly what worries me. I am afraid it is going to learn to crawl very fast, and then start to walk, and then run, until it expands into a much larger bureau than even the gentleman anticipates.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sure the gentleman realizes that with \$400,000 at present prices this bureau could not get very large. Further, when the proper time comes I will disabuse the gentleman's mind as to the type of bureau which will be created under this bill.

Mr. COLMER. Let me say to my friend that as one who is in the dark and who is seeking information I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman now out of my time to disabuse my mind now, because it needs a little disabusing.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will be glad to explain as best I can to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The bill H. R. 9040 provides only that the Commissioner of Education may enter into cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges, and State educational departments for the conduct of research. That proposes that a contract would be entered into. The law under which the Office of Education now operates allows this office to conduct research. The thesis behind this bill is to decentralize the research so that instead of having it all conducted in the Office of Education it may contract certain subjects of research to the institutions which are already in being and which may have peculiar knowledge of the subject at hand. Therefore, this information may be obtained in a less expensive way, and its obtaining may be facilitated by using facilities which are familiar with this particular type of thing.

Mr. COLMER. If I correctly understand the gentleman, the Department can already gain this information under existing law that they would gain as the result of the passage of this bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Of course I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I thought in fairness to the gentleman from Arizona he might want to answer that question. That is up to the gentleman.

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman from Arizona, the author, is doing a very good job of explaining it. I just want to supplement one part of it and say this to my very good friend from Mississippi, that this bill is absolutely in line with what the gentleman wishes, that is, that we do not build the Office of Education into a huge bureau for research, but rather that they let out cooperative contracts to have research done by universities, colleges, and various State educational departments. So this bill really gets away from the thing the gentleman is desirous of getting away from, that is,

the building of a big bureau here in Washington.

Mr. COLMER. Permit me to say to my friend that while I admit that he possibly hopes that will happen, I have dire apprehensions that that is not what will happen. Even if you limit this to \$400,000 by an amendment, there is nothing to prevent the same group from coming in here later and asking that that amendment be withdrawn and the ceiling lifted.

Mr. McCONNELL. Yes; but not to build up a big bureau. That is not what they are seeking to do. They are trying to get away from that. They have the authority now to conduct research. They could ask for that authority for themselves and build it into this huge bureau the gentleman fears. We are trying to avoid that. We say, let us, economically, and for the sake of not having a big bureau, farm it out and get research done by established agencies already in the United States without their building up a big bureau.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, the point I was trying to get across in my feeble way was: If they could do this now, then why have a new law passed? Would it not be a much simpler thing, if they are authorized to do this now, to add in the appropriation bill \$50,000 or \$100,000 to carry on this work for a year, and then next year they would have to come back and get the additional \$50,000 or \$100,000, and in that way we could keep tab on it?

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] has told you we are going to put in a set amount beyond which they are not to go, and, really, that was upon your suggestion, as I remember it, in the Committee on Rules itself. I agree that there should be a limit as to the amount that could be spent. It is anticipated that the first year \$100,000 will be used for cooperative associations for research by established agencies for that purpose in colleges and universities.

Mr. COLMER. May I say to the very able gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is my warm friend, that I have no argument with the question of limitation. I would like to see it limited to \$100,000 or \$50,000, as I think that would be important. But I go back to the fundamentals of the thing. I do not think it is necessary at all to set up this additional bureaucracy or commission, or whatever you may want to call it.

Mr. McCONNELL. It saves us money, and it also stops the building up of some new bureau or agency.

Mr. COLMER. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the full committee could give us any idea now about how much money is being spent in this field of research.

Mr. McCONNELL. I think the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] could give you that figure.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The total now being spent on research by the Office of Education is approximately \$600,000 per year. That is 40 percent of their total budget of \$1,500,000. It is my understanding at first that this amount would be as I said before in excess of

the amount now being spent for research, but as time goes along and these two programs can be integrated, the overall picture will show a saving in money for research because of the adoption of this bill.

If I might, I would like to address myself to another question which the gentleman raised, and that is the question of the necessity for this type of bill. I say, and it is true, the department or Office of Education now has authority to conduct research and they do. But, they do not have authority to make contracts for other people to conduct research. That is the reason for this bill coming before the House today. In other words, they can either conduct research with their own facilities or conduct no research at all. There is no way that they can under the present law contract for other educational institutions to do the research for them.

Mr. COLMER. I wonder if my friend thinks that if we are now expending \$600,000 a year for research, that it is necessary to spend another \$100,000 or \$400,000.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder if you could tell us how much the military now spends for research in these colleges and institutions.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not have those figures.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I wonder if this would be a duplication of what the military has been doing.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In answer to the gentleman's question, I certainly have a great amount of faith in those fine Members of the House of Representatives who sit on the Committee on Appropriations, and I would doubt that any duplication will take place in the appropriation of funds, as a result of this bill.

Mr. COLMER. Of course the gentleman knows from experience that once he gets an authorization the argument before the Appropriations Committee is that Congress has authorized this and therefore it is up to the Appropriations Committee to appropriate the money. That is the way we operate here.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have heard that argument but I have never found it to be very persuasive.

Mr. COLMER. That is the usual method of procedure anyway.

I am very much in sympathy with my distinguished young friend in his objectives sought here. I think he is doing a very fine job as a member of the committee, and I should like very much to go along with him, but I am just a little worried about where and when and how we are going to stop going into the red in this Federal Government. I would like to get this budget balanced. I would like to see a little prudence practiced, and retire perhaps \$400,000 a year on the national debt rather than adding that much to it. But I cannot follow my young friend in this. Perhaps he is right, but it seems to me that we are setting up something here that is unnecessary and establishing another bureaucracy.

[Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

[Mr. LANTAFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article.]

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK COULD PROVIDE A DIVIDEND TO THE AMERICAS

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, the time to develop a closer relationship between the Americas through action rather than words is certainly at hand. The Export-Import Bank could well provide the key to effect this development. I should like at this time to insert in the RECORD the following very timely and informative editorial on this subject which appeared in the Spanish-American newspaper the Americas Daily of Miami, Fla., on May 11, 1954:

THE ECONOMIC FUTURE OF LATIN AMERICA DEPENDS ON THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

In Sunday's issue of this paper we published the full-length version of a speech recently delivered before the Export Managers' Club, in New York, by Lynn U. Stambaugh, assistant manager of the Export-Import Bank. We did this so our readers could see that there is quite a good deal of cross purposes at work in American foreign policy as far as it concerns the other Americas.

As we see it, the problem can be boiled down to the following considerations:

Whenever Export-Import Bank funds have been used in the Latin American area, this has meant a profitable operation—not only for the bank itself but also for the American businessman who stands to gain because bank regulations require that American-made products must be utilized as far as feasible in such projects.

The bank still has a reserve of \$1½ billion that hasn't been touched, while \$500 million remain to be distributed in connection with now pending loans, and \$440 million will be collected by the bank in 1954 for reinvestment.

Secretary of State Dulles told the inter-American conference at Caracas recently that the Export-Import Bank was going to expand its lending services in the Latin American area. Last fall a Senate subcommittee on banking and currency urged an expansion of bank lending following an extensive tour by the committee of the Latin American nations. Meanwhile, however, nothing positive has been done to modify the situation, and the operations of the bank have been maintained practically the same as before.

It seems to us that every day that goes by without reformulation of Export-Import Bank policy means serious losses to the domestic economy of the United States in that new foreign markets are being allowed to go untouched. The Latin American countries suffer likewise from this situation.

By publishing the words of Mr. Stambaugh and by making these editorial comments we feel that we are doing our part in pointing out the various aspects of a problem which may have serious repercussions on the future of the Americas. The enormous production facilities of the United States stand in grave need of new markets. If allowed to develop in accordance with its potential resources, Latin American can supply those markets.

The problem won't be solved through keeping dollars locked up in the safes of the Export-Import Bank nor through depriving American productivity of the right to ex-

pand its markets abroad. Men of goodwill in this hemisphere want only one thing—that is, a steady outward flow of bank funds—not in the form of gifts but rather in that of productive loans which will have mutual benefits for both the United States and the nations of Latin America.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I make this request for time that I may expand a little on some questions that I propounded to the gentleman from West Virginia a little earlier in the debate on this rule.

It appears to me from what I know about the pending matter that it is no more nor less than an effort on the part of the powers that be, with all due respect to everybody concerned and interested in the matter, to set up a federally financed bull session on the general subject of education anywhere and everywhere that the Secretary or the Commissioner of the Office of Education may decide those bull sessions may be to the advantage of a particular viewpoint.

Mr. Speaker, I suggested in the questions I asked of the gentleman from West Virginia the possibility that the passage of this legislation constituted no more nor less than an outright insult to the administrative officials at the State level in all 48 States of this Union. It may not be true in every State, but I will guarantee you that if the Commissioner desires any information on the subject of education in the Empire State of the South, that is, Georgia, that a letter or a telephone call directed to Dr. M. D. Collins, State school superintendent, can elicit all the information that is required and it would not cost a single cent unless she does decide to make a telephone call, and then, of course, it would not cost her anything, but it will cost the taxpayers a great deal less if she makes a telephone call to the commissioners of education or the State school superintendents, or whatever their title may be, in all the 48 States. The cost will be much less than \$100,000 or probably \$400,000 that is sought as a limitation by the very distinguished author of this legislation.

I want it clearly understood, Mr. Speaker, that I do not want to inhibit any effort that is made by this Congress which could remotely be considered as an effort to further educational work in this country, but it appears to me that this pending legislation is simply a boondoggling matter; I cannot, to save my life, see where there is any good coming from this additional bureaucracy.

(Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

(Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor has reported out three measures dealing with education which we are to take up in the House this week as the Eisenhower administration's dynamic answer to the

crisis in our schools and educational system.

They are being treated as major legislative proposals, dignified by the granting of special rules for consideration and debate and are listed on the calendar and in the majority leader's schedule as the main legislative business before the House during the latter part of this week.

And what are these sensational proposals?

First. To authorize a White House conference on education, at which educators and interested citizens representing the respective States can come together and discuss the problems of the Nation's schools.

Second. To authorize \$200,000 a year for the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Education, composed of 9 persons who will advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the various pressing problems in the field of education.

Third. To authorize \$100,000 or so for use by the Office of Education to make arrangements with universities, colleges, and State educational departments for joint studies of the problems of American education.

THE KIND OF AID THE SCHOOLS NEED LEAST

This is the Eisenhower administration's aid-to-education program—in toto.

Obviously, it will build no new schools, raise no teacher's pay, do nothing about the horrible overcrowding and unsafe conditions in many of our elementary and secondary schools which are bursting at the seams, it will not aid any distressed community to meet its crushing burden in providing decent schools for its children.

Instead, through three separate pieces of legislation, we are going to provide the kind of aid the schools of the United States least need right now—aid in finding out what their problems are.

If there is any section of American society more cognizant of its problems than our educational system, I would like to know what it is. The school boards, the superintendents, the principals and the teachers in our public schools know exactly what ails the schools, and the knowledge is painful.

What they need are:

First. Funds for additional school construction.

Second. Funds for more teachers.

Third. Funds for better pay for teachers.

Fourth. Funds for books, supplies, tools, equipment.

Instead of funds, the Eisenhower administration is offering the schools of this country a pipsqueak program of inquiry into the problems of education.

From what my friends in school administration and in teaching tell me, there is very little wrong with America's public schools that some well-placed appropriations could not cure.

SPENDING THOUSANDS WHERE MILLIONS ARE NEEDED

All three of the education bills coming before us this week authorize the expenditure of Federal funds. The first provides for \$750,000 for the White House

conference and for similar preliminary conferences in each State. This is by far the biggest appropriation authorized in any of these measures, but it is a one-shot proposal, a single appropriation covering a specific event and therefore not recurrent in future appropriation measures.

The other two provide for annual appropriations aggregating \$300,000 altogether—\$300,000 a year to find out what is wrong with our schools.

What is needed, of course, is at least \$300 million a year to help our schools.

This is the amount proposed by former President Truman and supported by the late Mr. Republican himself, the late Senator Taft. But in that respect—as in public housing—Senator Taft was considered a dangerous radical by most of his party's members in the Congress, and presumably now by President Eisenhower, too.

If \$300 million a year was a realistic figure in 1947 and 1949—as I think it was—then a realistic figure today would be much higher, at least 15 percent higher.

But in these measures coming before the House we are providing authorization for a total of about \$300,000 a year for study.

STUDIES GENERALLY DUPLICATE OTHERS NOW IN PROGRESS

While I do not intend to oppose the three measures which have been proposed by the Eisenhower administration as its dynamic answer to our education problems—certainly any Federal activity in this regard is useful if it helps to bring home to Congress the need for effective corrective action—I do feel that the studies proposed here generally duplicate others now in progress.

For instance, the proposed White House conference and the preliminary State conferences on education are designed, we are told by the bill's sponsors, "to bring together educators and interested citizens to discuss their particular educational problems and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken at local, State, and Federal levels. Provision for this series of conferences is based on the sound concept that the problems of the Nation's schools must be solved cooperatively by the local community, the State, and the Federal Government, with the fullest possible use being made of local and State resources, and with the Federal Government coming into the picture only where the national interest requires national leadership and action."

While that sounds interesting, the fact remains that all of the professional groups in the educational field—the teachers, the principals, the superintendents, the administrators—constantly hold State and national conferences and conventions; so do the parent-teachers' associations, the women's clubs, the members of boards of education, and so on. They know what their problems are and they share their information in meeting those problems as best they can. They need from the Federal Government not so much national leadership—an adequately staffed and

properly supported United States Office of Education would provide all of that needed—but Federal financial help. Most communities in the country have taxed real estate and other local sources to the hilt for their schools; they still cannot make ends meet and provide the kind of schools which are needed.

But that is not reason enough to oppose a White House conference. I think it can help the situation by focusing attention on the true and alarming extent of the financial problem of our schools, and if it does that it will accomplish a great deal. But let us not feel that in passing the authorization for this conference we are waving some magic, inexpensive wand which solves our educational crisis.

PROPOSED NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION CAN HANDLE

The proposal in the second bill to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education of nine lay citizens to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to the most pressing problems in the field of education seems to me to duplicate to a large extent work which is now—or should be—progressing under the Office of Education.

For instance, among the problems which the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor outlined for possible study by such a committee in his report on this bill are the following:

(a) The relationship between dropouts in school and juvenile delinquency; (b) illiteracy, particularly in relation to selective service rejections, (c) special instruction for exceptional children, (d) educating the children of migratory workers, (e) the education of teachers.

All well and good. But these are obvious areas for the Office of Education to begin with. If it has not the staff or the funds for this kind of work, it should get them.

As the report on the bill points out, such an advisory committee could probably be set up administratively without special legislation although the question seems to have been raised somewhere that there might be some doubts regarding the legality of that course of action. But to put this forward as a major accomplishment toward solving our educational problems is nonsensical. It seems to me nothing more than a minor administrative step dressed up to look like dynamic legislation.

RESEARCH PROGRAM TO SPEND PENNIES ON PROJECTS FOUNDATIONS ALREADY SUBSIDIZE WITH MILLIONS

The third bill we will consider in this bold program to solve the educational crisis—to establish a cooperative research program in educational problems, with the Government working through colleges and universities—contemplates, as I said, an annual expenditure of \$100,000. And these are some of the areas of prospective research:

(a) Reducing the cost of educational facilities. (b) Improving business procedures in schools and colleges. (c) Reorganizing school districts for maximum efficiency. (d) Attracting more young people into teaching, engineering, and other shortage professions.

(e) Improving teaching methods. (f) Developing closer ties with parents and citizens. (g) Placing community health and social agencies in proper perspective with school programs.

I do not know exactly how much the Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Sloan, Falk, or other foundations have made available for work of this nature, but I am sure it surpasses many times over the \$100,000 a year this bill proposes as a Federal research program in this field.

And I do not care how many millions are spent on studying the problem of attracting more young people into teaching—the solution is so obvious it can be found without spending a cent. As long as teaching school remains one of the poorest paid professions into which a college graduate can go, the problem of attracting young people into this field is going to remain acute.

The report on this bill has an additional interesting comment:

For example, Minnesota may be studying more effective utilization of the services of teachers. Many other States may share the same general concern, but the particulars of their respective problems may be sufficiently different to render the Minnesota findings inapplicable for their purposes. This bill would make possible contributions of funds from the Office of Education in order to enlarge the scope of the study so as to make the findings more widely useful.

To that I would say this: As long as our schools are so overcrowded and our teachers so horribly overworked by horribly oversized classes, it is going to be mighty difficult, if not impossible, to find a real solution to the problem of effective utilization of the services of teachers. What is needed, of course, is more teachers and smaller classes. And there is nothing in any of this legislation—any part of this three-piece package of dynamic Republican policy on education—to solve that problem.

TIME TO GET DOWN TO SOME BRASS-TACKS LEGISLATING

It is indeed a source of wonder to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have to set aside two or more days of the time of this House to debate and pass these three innocuous and ineffectual bills. I should think that if they were put on the Consent Calendar they could be passed routinely by unanimous consent in 5 minutes' time. They are as noncontroversial as they are ineffective in meeting the real needs of our educational system.

Instead, we have seen them dressed up to look like major pieces of legislation, submitted to the Rules Committee for clearance, and brought out on the floor under the elaborate procedure reserved usually for important legislation.

Is this because there is no important legislation on the calendar to require the time of the House and that we have got to go through the motions of looking busy on important matters even when there are not any to consider?

This session is nearly over; this term of Congress which began January 3, 1953, is nearly over. We have done little except pass appropriation bills. There are no major legislative accomplishments to point to. There is no dynamic, progressive program. There is only the piece-

meal half-measure approach we see in these no-aid-to-education bills.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. I would like to say to my colleague and friend on the committee from New Jersey that I have stated that a subcommittee will conduct hearings on construction aid to the schools of the country. I agreed to that. We are now in process of appointing a subcommittee.

Mr. HOWELL. I thank the chairman. I am pleased indeed to head that; I think it is an important thing to take it up at this time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I went around the world as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. It was good to get back in America and my native Oklahoma after several weeks of study and firsthand observation of conditions in Korea, Indochina, the Far East, and parts of Europe as they relate to the economy and peace of our world. I am happy to report that the American aid and foreign policy have had a wholesome effect in bringing order out of confusion, strength out of weakness, unity out of division, and hope out of despair. Yet, I must admit, there is still much suffering, poverty, and illness in our allied nations. I returned to America with a sense of rededication to the great principles of American democracy and with renewed devotion to serve and promote the general welfare of our citizens.

The adverse conditions of poverty, ignorance, disease, the constant threat of war, and the insidious influences of communism, under which the people in most of the nations work, are not conducive to a wholesome spirit of unity, pride, and productiveness.

It has been said many times that America is great, not because of her natural resources and her rich land, but because of her people who harness her resources and make the land bring forth its wealth. We are proud of the fact that we have more than 60 million persons employed in the various areas of production. But, even in America, there are people who suffer from disabilities—physical handicaps—such as the blind, the deaf, the lame, and others with disabling diseases. Seven million of these work in spite of these handicaps. However, there are others—2 million other handicapped persons who would and could work if they were provided with the needed medical treatment and taught a skill in keeping with their physical capacities. Oklahoma has its share of this group who, due to disabilities caused by accident, disease, or other reason, are not a part of the labor market. What is Oklahoma doing for its handicapped citizens who are of employable age and who have an employment potential?

(a) We could call your attention to hundreds of disabled persons within the boundaries of the Sixth Congressional District, who, through the specialized

services of the vocational rehabilitation division of the State board of vocational education, are employed and making their own way. Time will permit me to mention only a few.

I recall a fine young man who made a splendid record in the Mangum High School. He engaged in the school and community activities as any normal boy would. He planned for an objective which would yield abundant returns in services to his fellow man, but which also held rather rigid physical requirements. A few years after he completed high school he developed arthritis which left its disabling effects. He could no longer meet the physical demands of his chosen profession. It was necessary for him to change to some type of sedentary work. A counselor of the Vocational Rehabilitation Service helped this young man to make an adjustment to a new vocation. Through the service of vocational rehabilitation he was trained as a draftsman. He is now profitably employed by one of the major oil companies in Oklahoma.

(b) In Frederick we have an impressive example of a blind man working as a radio station operator. Blinded in youth, this man has endeared himself to the people of his community and through the services of vocational rehabilitation and friends has become a valuable employee of a radio station.

(c) The switchboard operator in one of the leading banks in Lawton had fought a 20-year battle to regain use of her polio-crippled legs. The Oklahoma Vocational Rehabilitation Division provided physical restoration and training for this person and assisted her in finding satisfactory employment.

It is estimated there are between 30,000 and 40,000 men and women of working age in Oklahoma so severely disabled by physical or mental impairments that they cannot support themselves or their families. Each year the disabling effects of injury, illness, or congenital causes add to the growing number of disabled persons.

Shall we neglect or correct these conditions?

Neglected disability means waste of productive energy, unnecessary unemployment; dependency on family, denying or curtailing opportunities for children or parents of the disabled; dependency on public charity and assistance, a constant drain on the resources of Oklahoma and the Nation.

One neglected disability generally takes two people out of production; usually the mother, wife, husband, or child of the disabled person becomes the slave of the neglected disability. Neglected disability feeds upon itself. Continued disuse of physical and mental powers aggravates the impairment and weakens the will to regain lost abilities and to learn new skills.

Corrected disability means salvage of wasted manpower; more production for our State and Nation in peace or in war; reduced financial burdens on the families of the disabled; expanded opportunities for the children of the disabled to develop into good, useful, and productive citizens.

The disabled whom we rehabilitate are the people who now live and will continue to live in Oklahoma. They will prove either burdens or assets to us. They will either reduce or increase the wealth of Oklahoma.

If these people are to lead reasonably useful lives, if they are to become self-supporting or useful to their families, they must have some or all of the services provided through the State-Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Service which was made possible by an act of Congress as one answer to the problem of disability.

We have a very effective vocational rehabilitation service in Oklahoma. During the past 3 years it rehabilitated 3,766 disabled persons. I am pleased to report that of these, 629 or approximately one-sixth, lived in the Sixth Congressional District. These are your neighbors, your friends, or perhaps members of your family. You know how the services made available to these persons through the rehabilitation agency have benefited these individuals and given them the satisfaction of employment which provides them with a self-sustaining income. In fact 15 percent of the number were taken directly from the public assistance rolls. More important perhaps than the number of persons who have been rehabilitated is the fact that over the years many hundreds of persons have been kept from ever getting on public-assistance rolls, as a result of having had the opportunity to secure vocational rehabilitation assistance when it was first needed.

There are many indications that Oklahoma is becoming aware of the tremendous possibilities and potentialities of vocational rehabilitation. For instance, the Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Okla., has recently established a comprehensive rehabilitation center in connection with its school of technical training at Okmulgee. This center, utilizing the medical techniques which proved so effective in the treatment of veterans following the last war, will facilitate the rehabilitation and return to employment of our most severely disabled citizens.

It is of utmost importance that the most severely of our disabled be given a chance, for they have much to give. Ruby Fariss Bonnell, county superintendent of schools at Sayre, my friend, and successful public official, is doing a wonderful job in spite of a serious disability.

All of us know and admire people who have overcome the handicap of a physical disability, and all of us take pride in what Oklahoma is doing to help others. The center at Okmulgee is an example of the extent to which our State is taking the lead in this respect.

Already 182 persons have been served at this center, and an increasing number will be served as trained personnel and funds are available. Since the center is the first facility of its kind west of the Mississippi River, disabled persons from five of the surrounding States are now included among the patients, and there are new inquiries from other States in the Southwest almost daily. The possibilities of this new facility, where the

best in medicine and vocational training are combined and integrated, are almost unlimited, provided adequate staff and funds are available. The center provides services for the vocational rehabilitation division on a fee basis, but limited funds for vocational rehabilitation places a definite limit on the number of disabled persons who may be served.

Vocational rehabilitation, through its various services, attempts to bring about vocational adjustment for the individual who has a disability due to birth, accident, or disease which renders him at a disadvantage when preparing for, seeking, or applying for a job.

It is well to bear in mind that unless a person has sufficient capacities remaining so that he may be trained for or placed in some remunerative activity either in the home or in public employment, the individual cannot be accepted for service.

During the past 3 years the vocational rehabilitation service of Oklahoma has worked with 9,593 handicapped persons. Many of these are still in the process of rehabilitation. Three thousand seven hundred and sixty-six of the above number have been rehabilitated into employment.

REHABILITATION PAYS

During the 3-year period from June 30, 1950, to June 30, 1953, the Oklahoma vocational rehabilitation division of the State board of vocational education provided services to 9,593 handicapped individuals. Of this number, 3,766 completed their rehabilitation and accepted employment, while others are still in the process of rehabilitation. The expenditures for rehabilitation services for the 9,593 persons served during the 3-year period amounted to \$1,310,230.

The annual earnings of the 3,766 persons rehabilitated during the 3-year period before rehabilitation were \$854,948; after rehabilitation were \$6,808,828. This is a gain of \$6,053,880 in earnings. It is estimated that for each dollar spent for rehabilitation, the Government gets back \$10. This is the dollar-and-cents justification of the program. As a businessman, I would like to ask you where you can get such liberal returns on your investment. I would personally be happy to put some of my own money into an investment making such returns.

In this country, where we assume equality of opportunity in the pursuit of human happiness, it is our obligation to see that, to the extent possible, physical disability brought about by disease or injury does not result in the destruction of those qualities which make man a self-respecting citizen. Any other attitude is to deny the principles of liberty and equality, on which our country was founded.

When a severely handicapped man, following rehabilitation, swings on his crutches into a welfare office to announce that he no longer needs the grant he has been receiving, the economic values are apparent. But how much more important to him than the dollars he earns, is the feeling he now has for himself and others; and how much more important to society than the tax dollars being saved is the gain in good citizen-

ship. It takes little imagination to comprehend the great difference it makes to the State that all its citizens be able to hold their heads high with a sense of belonging, of participation, of contribution.

When considering appropriations for various Government functions, I have given special consideration to programs which are reducing the tax burden. There are those who feel that vocational rehabilitation, like many other programs which are supported by both the Federal and State Governments, should be returned entirely to the States. I would not object to that providing the State were in position to pick up the check and provide for the continued growth of this fine program. At the present, however, and perhaps within the foreseeable future, that does not seem to be practical. Therefore, it is my belief that until we are able to rehabilitate as many of our people who become disabled each year, both the Federal Government and the State should increase their investment in the rehabilitation of our disabled citizens, and it shall be my purpose within my ability, to help bring that about.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of the committee for appointing a subcommittee to consider the bill for Federal aid to school construction. I am strongly in favor of it, I believe it is a proper area of responsibility of the Federal Government, and I am glad to see the committee giving it attention.

School construction is one of the major national problems we face and it is going to get worse, not better. We need to increase the rate of school construction by 50 percent from now until 1960 and Federal help is vital if it is to be done. Our rate of construction must go up in the Nation from 50,000 to at least 75,000 classrooms a year.

In New York City there is an estimated need according to the board of education for 312 new school buildings, costing \$425 million alone, plus sites, modernization of other buildings, and so forth.

School enrollment is estimated to reach its postwar high in 1955-56 and accelerate the needs everywhere.

I favor also fundamental Federal aid for schools which has been considered in the Congress for a long time. The need for adequate teaching staff getting fair compensation is particularly grave.

These are essential national concerns—these matters of schools and education—a decent education is the right of every American child. To be in the highest sense world leaders—a role destiny has chosen for us—such an objective is a bedrock requirement for us.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, with Mr. LeCOMPTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. McCONNELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, as you have heard previously, this is the first bill in a series of three bills designed expressly to aid the cause of education of the youth of America. I am particularly pleased not only to support these bills for the reason that they are helpful in a most vital field but I am also very pleased to support them because they have been sponsored by three young capable members of the committee of which I happen to be chairman.

These bills have been supported by many lay groups, by teacher groups, and by labor.

The first one, H. R. 9040, the one we are presently considering, authorizes the Office of Education to enter into cooperative research arrangements with universities, colleges, and State educational departments for research into various aspects connected with education. This is not a boondoggling arrangement. There is no thought in mind of using this to avoid meeting the problem of education at the local or State level. That is not the purpose of this bill at all. The purpose is to save money and to avoid building up in the Office of Education a large staff of research assistants, the feeling being that it would be much more effective, more efficient and cheaper to make use of existing organizations already conducting research in the field of education.

I might give the example of a research project, and I hope they make it, to find out how we can cut down the expense of new school facilities. The cost to the various school districts of America is becoming prohibitive and it is hoped that they can find new types of material, new types of facilities and arrangements so that considerable money can be saved to a school district. I do not think of that as a boondoggling proposition. I think it is a very fine thing if we could assemble in one spot in our Government the results of studies of that nature so that any school district could communicate with the Office of Education and find out what can be done in connection with materials and facilities so far as the construction of their schools are concerned.

It is not my purpose to take too much time at the moment, because I would like to have the author of the bill, the gentle-

man from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], go into greater detail concerning it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Can the gentleman tell me how much this program will cost?

Mr. McCONNELL. They are planning to ask for \$100,000 the first year. As I mentioned a little bit earlier, it was suggested before the Rules Committee that a limitation be placed on the bill as in the other bills. It is the plan of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], to limit it to no more than \$400,000 in any year.

Mr. FOGARTY. In any 1 year?

Mr. McCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. How many years will this continue on?

Mr. McCONNELL. There is no set time. It is one of the permanent plans that we have for the Office of Education. You see, the Office of Education was set up to make studies and to make those studies available to the Nation in the field of education, but they feel they cannot go on beyond where they are now in their research efforts without a much larger staff, and rather than do that they think this would be a much more efficient way of doing it.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am not quarreling with the purpose of the act, but did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that this or the other two bills pending will in no way retard the hearings for the continuation of Public Law 815?

Mr. McCONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. FOGARTY. If I remember correctly, I read a statement in the newspaper this morning where the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare sent a letter to the Senate committee in effect saying that she opposed the Senate bill pending the White House conference on education and maybe the passage of this bill, which would postpone until 1956 any action on laws such as Public Law 815.

Mr. McCONNELL. I do not know what final action will take place. The gentleman asked me whether this would retard the hearings in our committee, I assume, with this bill being passed, and I say again, no.

Mr. FOGARTY. Could I ask one more question?

Mr. McCONNELL. Surely.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the Department of Education suggests to your subcommittee or to your full committee that in view of the fact that the White House conference is going to be held and that we have passed this bill, maybe waiting 2 or 3 years to see whether or not we need any extension of Public Law 815, would that be sufficient to retard the hearings?

Mr. McCONNELL. I do not understand the gentleman's reference to 815.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is Public Law 815.

Mr. McCONNELL. Yes. I know of no objection to the extension of 815. The gentleman is speaking of construction aid?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Maintenance and operation and aid to those districts affected by Federal impact?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no reason why an extension of these provisions would be delayed by the passage of this bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman remembers that the Department refused to ask the Bureau of the Budget for certain moneys to carry out the purposes of Public Law 815 only a short while ago.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is right, and the gentleman knows my position on that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I know, and the gentleman is for it.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is right.

Mr. FOGARTY. And it was due to the gentleman's support and cooperation that regardless of the Department of Education and the Bureau of the Budget, the House by unanimous vote gave \$55 million just a month or so ago.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is right.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. My question pertains to the word "arrangement." The language reads that "the Office of Education" and so on "is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges, and State educational departments for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education."

What is embraced in the word "arrangements"?

Mr. McCONNELL. Contracting for the performance of research activities. Rather than having the office itself do it, they would make a financial contract or arrangement with a college or university to handle that research proposition.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Where would the funds come from, out of the Federal Treasury, or would the local institutions have to contribute?

Mr. McCONNELL. The funds would come from the Treasury, through the Office of Education. We could authorize the Office to conduct it themselves, but they think it would be better to enable them to make these cooperative arrangements with outside institutions rather than build up a bureau and do it themselves.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Assuming that the research was made in these outside institutions, and this Department would express a view that what was going on in that institution was not in conformity with their ideas, could they compel the university to conform to what the Government wanted them to do, or is it merely in a financial capacity?

Mr. McCONNELL. I would say they would have control of the contract and the arrangements only.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. If that is true, that the department by mandate rather than being in a discretionary position, can demand what the university or the school shall do, are we not then getting into a state where we are having Government interference with local education?

Mr. McCONNELL. No, I think the gentleman is a little bit off the point on that. For instance, the Office of Education will decide that some subjects should be made the matter of research; for instance, it might have to do with better reorganization of the school districts, or it might be cheaper facilities in school, or better methods of handling certain types of the physically handicapped pupils, or something of that sort. They will say, "Instead of our conducting that research, we would like you to conduct that research along these particular lines and give us your conclusions along these lines which we have set out." They are not going to say, "You have got to bring out a report in line with our conclusions."

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I understand.

Mr. McCONNELL. They will only say, "We want you to bring out a report on this subject in line with what we have asked you to investigate and not to go far afield and into something else."

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] then takes the position that whatever the Government would do under this piece of legislation, it would be discretionary and not mandatory. In other words, they could not force the universities to do what they had already decided to do in the matter of research and investigation.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is correct; in other words, they are not going to ask the research staff to bring in some preconceived recommendation. That is not the purpose.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill. As a matter of fact, it is so simple and it says so little and attempts to do so little in the face of what the American educational system needs today that I am sorry that we have it before the House. I wish it were a bill that met America's educational problems head on, and provided some real aid for America's schools—aid without control.

Here is what this bill does. This bill recognizes the fact that already the Office of Education has the legislative authority to do research work in the field of public schools and educational activities in those schools. This bill says that we do not want the Office of Education doing that research itself, headquartered here in Washington, when it can be well done in some other place. We say in this bill that instead of the Office of Education doing this research that it deems necessary, that it have the authority and the power to go down to the State of Alabama or the State of Mississippi and contract with that State department of education to carry on research in the field in which it wants information or knowledge.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would this bill give the Commissioner of Education the

authority to contract with any other than State institutions?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No, sir.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes; it does.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It does, as I read it. It says, "Universities, colleges, and State educational departments."

Mr. ELLIOTT. I may be in error about that. I was under the impression that it was the State educational institutions.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it the intention of the committee to confine these contracts to the State institutions?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; I doubt that it is the intention of the committee to put that restriction on it, but instead to allow the Office of Education to contract with any college or any university in America that is equipped to do the needed research.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What was the yardstick used to determine how much money would be required to do this research?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not know what the yardstick was. I think there is in this bill no limitation; and I am against any limitation being put in because for \$400,000 a year you cannot do the necessary research in this field. I think it is a shame to put a limitation in this bill of \$400,000.

Mr. Chairman, with the needs of America's schools being what they are, with a simple bill here that says that local educational institutions can do the research that the Office of Education thinks ought to be done, what is wrong with allowing it to farm out at the local level, to the University of Alabama or to the Alabama Polytechnic Institute or to the State teachers' colleges of Alabama or to Birmingham Southern College in Alabama, or to Howard College, or to any other college? The research may be done in the field of reducing the cost of educational facilities.

Mr. Chairman, today we are faced in the State of Alabama with an immediate need to build \$300 million worth of new school buildings. That problem is upon us. If we can find out how to cut the cost of those buildings by \$10,000 each, this research will be worth all that will ever be spent upon it.

Another subject this authority for research might be used on is that of improving business procedures in schools and colleges, reorganizing school districts for maximum efficiency, attracting more young people into the teaching, engineering, and other "shortage" professions, improving teaching methods, developing closer ties with parents and citizens, and placing community health and social agencies in proper perspective with school-program needs of America. Such a small amount of money is involved, when the need is so great, and we haggle about three or four hundred thousand dollars for this purpose.

Just 16 years ago now a few scientists set themselves to the business of trying to find out something about the synthetic fibers. They were laughed at. They isolated some of the constituent elements of those fibers. About 5 or 6 years after their work was completed we were in war with Japan and our sup-

ply of silk was cut off completely. From that research, from the isolation of the constituent elements of those fibers, we developed nylon commercially and the nylon parachute and the hundreds of other uses that nylon was put to in World War II, and since. This business of research is important. Pure research is important. Applied research is important.

Mr. Chairman, the shame of it is that we are spending so little today in the field of educational research and in the field of medical research. Today, Mr. Chairman, if we appropriated sufficient funds, cancer, heart disease, and all these dread diseases could be wiped out, just as in the Manhattan project we gave the funds to build the atomic bomb, shorten World War II, and save thousands of American lives. Nothing is more important to America than its research. This bill does very little. It is a States' rights bill. I do not believe there is a single well-founded objection to it.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], a member of our committee and the author of the bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. H. R. 9040, to establish a cooperative research program, represents useful complement to other educational proposals of the administration. It would carry out the President's budget message recommendation "that legislation be enacted which will enable the Office of Education to join its resources with those of State and local agencies, universities, and other educational organizations for the conduct of cooperative research, surveys, and demonstration projects."

The purpose of this research program is to strengthen educational research services and facilities by authorizing cooperative research arrangements between the Federal Government and various other agencies, institutions, and organizations concerned with the problems of American education. At the present time the Office of Education is not specifically authorized to enter into projects involving the joint expenditure of funds for these purposes.

Cooperative research arrangements of the sort proposed in H. R. 9040 have shown great returns—notably in the field of public health—for each Federal dollar spent. We are convinced that such arrangements can make equally valuable contributions in the field of education where the need for research is great.

One important advantage of the approach proposed in H. R. 9040 is that, while increasing and improving the research services available, the bill would not add substantially to the research staff of the Office of Education.

At the present time, the Office of Education has no legislative authority to enter into contracts for jointly financed research projects with colleges, universities, and State departments of education. Joint efforts with such groups are of basic importance because it is in these agencies that able research personnel and resources that could not otherwise be enlisted are to be found.

A prime advantage of cooperative work with agencies in the field is that such procedure avoids the centralization of staff and facilities in Washington.

There are many areas in the field of education in which cooperative research holds out great promise for increased economy and efficiency.

Examples of research areas in which studies might be undertaken to improve school efficiency are:

First. Costs of school and college buildings.

Second. Business procedures in schools and colleges.

Third. School district reorganization.

Fourth. Adequate staffing of teaching, engineering, and other shortage professions.

Fifth. Teaching methods.

Sixth. Relationships of community health and social agencies to community programs.

General practice with respect to educational research today usually involves study of local problems by those directly concerned at the local level. This procedure is sometimes wasteful because many matters of local concern are, in fact, common to other groups across our Nation. Too often only those concerned locally profit from their research. Enlarging the scope of a local or State study so as to make its finding usable by others in other regions would be an efficient procedure. But a locality or State would be reluctant to put in the added cost just to make the research for demonstration more useful on a nationwide basis. For example, Minnesota may be studying more effective use of the services of teachers. Many other States may share the same general concern, but the particulars of their respective problems may be sufficiently different to render the Minnesota findings inapplicable for their purposes. This bill would make possible contributions of funds from the Office of Education and the assistance of staff members of the Office of Education who are familiar with areas which require study—to the end that research and surveys of general interest be enlarged as appropriate to make them widely useful.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. I notice on page 2 of the report there are set out some examples of research study. I notice paragraph C mentions reorganizing school districts for maximum efficiency. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Does he seriously believe that the Federal Department of Education could be of assistance to my local community or to his local community in our States and tell us how we should set up our school systems and our school districts?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In response to the gentleman's question, I would like to say I do not believe it is the intent of the Office of Education to try to tell anybody anything unless they ask for this information. In my own State, the educational situation has become acute because of the great growth in areas around the city of Phoenix. Many districts which were formerly country

schools now operate several complete school plants. I would say very frankly, I doubt very much this particular paragraph regarding the reorganizing of school districts could be of much help to your district or to my district because every school and every State is operating under different laws. On the other hand, it may become very germane to the issue in determining what other districts and other States are doing with similar laws.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman because I want to believe, in fact, I am sure, that my school system in the State of Georgia would know far more about how it should cut up their school districts than anybody in a Washington office.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Many years ago the city of Stockton, where I live in California, had a survey made of their school system by a Dr. Sears of Stafford University.

Would the law which you are discussing today, if it becomes law, contemplate doing research along that line?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. What type of survey was made?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They surveyed the whole situation of the schools, to see whether they needed new buildings, whether the curriculum was right, and so on. At the time I was chairman of the planning commission, and he wanted me to show him the city, where the poor people lived, where the rich people lived, where the industries were located, and where the railroads were. He went into the whole thing, and finally, at a cost of \$10,000, produced a survey of our school system. Is that the kind of work contemplated to be done under this act?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would say that is a possible type of work which might be contemplated, but not likely. In other words, the surveys made under this particular legislation would be in matters which are of nationwide importance, matters which would be fairly common to any school district throughout the United States, or which can be put on a more or less uniform level. I would doubt that the expense of surveys in individual communities would ever be assumed by the Office of Education.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In other words, they would make a kind of group study, which the cities could look into and see if they could adapt themselves and if the recommendations would fit their needs?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Take the category concerning research in school construction. That would be a subject upon which information should be available in the Office of Education, and which would be needed by any school district which might desire to build new schools. Your particular area would want studies from an area which was similar in latitude, in weather, and other conditions. That is the the type of

study which I believe would be made under this particular law.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does the gentleman feel, in answer to the questions of the gentleman from Georgia, which go to the very heart of this educational problem that we have before us today, that the Federal Government actually can be of some aid to his school districts? The Office of Education can be of some help, but it only operates in the school districts upon request; it has no authority from Congress, or by Executive order, to go into any school district in the country. Is that correct? And, further, is it not true that opposition to this bill clearly indicates how a man would feel on improving matters in his school district?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is absolutely correct. There has been some talk of compulsion under this bill. Actually, it is entirely on a voluntary basis. Whether a school district wants to accept the help of the Office of Education is entirely its own decision. Whether they want to enter into a contract for making a survey is entirely voluntary. There is nothing that is compulsory.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I do believe that on at least two occasions with which I have had experience in Illinois leads me to believe this would be a good law. In 1949 and 1950 in Illinois we had the latest experience in revising school districts and constituting new districts, on which nothing had been done for over 60 years. There were many high schools which had been unable to be supported. We created new unit school districts and enlarged districts to the point where they could support a high school.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SPRINGER. When that revision was taken, I believe that was the most far-reaching revision of the district school system we have had in the United States in my time. If this law had been in effect and previous studies had been made before that reorganization took place, much good could have been accomplished. That was a very trying experience. Litigation of all kinds arose out of it. I happen to have been judge on some of the litigation which took place in my own county.

If a study had been made in Illinois under the system set up in this bill we in Illinois would have been saved many headaches. In addition the Office of Education would have had on hand a record of this study and also a report of the reorganization experience in Illinois this would have been available to other States who today are contemplating similar reorganizations. I support the bill and recommend its passage.

Mr. HOSMER. I firmly believe that the Federal bureaucracy should be kept strictly out of local school matters. I ask the gentleman whether there can be any implication by reason of any arrangement or contracts with local school districts that would allow the Federal bureaucrats to get in and control any of them?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Let me say that I am in hearty agreement with the gentleman from California, and if there were any such provision in this bill I certainly would not have offered it.

While the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], is on his feet I would like to commend him, because I recall his amendment restoring funds for financial assistance for Federally impacted school districts. I think they finally resulted in payments of over a quarter of million dollars to schools in his own district.

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to state that I supported in committee H. R. 7601, a bill providing for a White House Conference on Education; H. R. 7434, a bill providing for a National Advisory Committee on Education; and H. R. 9040, a bill authorizing Cooperative Research in Education.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support on the floor all three of these measures. I am sure that every Member in the Congress will agree with the purposes set forth in these bills. At the same time, I feel confident that many Members are wondering about the publicity surrounding this White House Conference on Education in the year of 1956.

Also, Members undoubtedly feel that this legislation is just more evidence of government by postponement. This bill originally authorized \$1,500,000 but the committee cut the authorization down to \$750,000 for the Commissioner of Education to administer the act and for other expenses of the Office of Education in planning for and holding the White House Conference on Education. The original bill also provided that no State's allotment shall be less than \$10,000 but the committee struck \$10,000 and inserted \$5,000. I would like to read from the report accompanying H. R. 7601, the purposes of the bill:

This bill authorizes appropriations to enable the President to hold in the city of Washington, D. C., a conference of educators and interested laymen from all parts of the Nation, to be called the White House Conference on Education, to consider and report to the President on significant and pressing problems in the field of education. The sums appropriated are to be used in assisting each State to bring together educators and interested citizens to discuss their particular educational problems within the State and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken at local, State, and Federal levels. These State conferences would enlist the participation of interested laymen and community leaders, as well as professional educators, in the consideration of the grave educational problems existing throughout the Nation today and center attention on the ways in which the State and local resources can be mobilized.

Following these State conferences, representatives of all of the States would be brought together in Washington to consider the educational problems from the national viewpoint. This conference would be known as the White House Conference on Education and would utilize the results of all of the State conferences in the study and consideration of the educational problems of the Nation.

Provision for this series of conferences is based on the sound concept that the problems of the Nation's schools must be solved cooperatively by the local community, the State, and the Federal Government, with the fullest possible use being made of local and State resources, and with the Federal Government coming into the picture only where the national interest requires national leadership and action.

Allotments to States. Sums appropriated for the purpose of enabling each State to hold a conference on educational problems would be allotted to the States on the basis of their respective populations, according to the latest figures certified by the Department of Commerce, except that no State's allotment shall be less than \$5,000.

The bill authorizes the Commissioner of Education to pay, through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, an allotment to each State which, through its governor or other State official designated by the governor, undertakes to accept and use the sums so paid exclusively for the purpose of holding a State conference on education and to make a report of the findings and recommendations of the State conference for the use of the White House Conference on Education. The sums appropriated for this purpose would remain available until December 31, 1955, and any such sums remaining unpaid to the States or unobligated by them as of that date would be returned to the Treasury.

H. R. 7343, a bill establishing a National Advisory Committee on Education, authorizes appropriations to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act, including expenses of professional, clerical, and stenographic assistance. The bill also authorizes an appropriation for the cost of such studies as the committee might recommend for an amount needed not to exceed \$200,000 in any fiscal year. On page 2 of the report accompanying H. R. 7343, we find the responsibility of the committee spelled out as follows:

The committee's responsibility will be to appraise the most pressing problems in the field of education; to decide which seem to be capable of practical solutions after appropriate study and action; to set priorities as to the immediacy with which each should be attacked; to consider how the study and action called for should be organized; and to advise the Secretary on the progress of study and action. Educators would have key roles in the activities of the committee in that their knowledge and experience would be used in their services as members of the task forces making the studies and reporting their findings.

In connection with H. R. 9040, a bill authorizing cooperative research in education, I would like to list the examples of research studies set forth in the report accompanying this bill:

- (a) Reducing the cost of educational facilities.
- (b) Improving business procedures in schools and colleges.
- (c) Reorganizing school districts for maximum efficiency.

(d) Attracting more young people into teaching, engineering, and other shortage professions.

(e) Improving teaching methods.

(f) Developing closer ties with parents and citizens.

(g) Placing community health and social agencies in proper perspective with school programs.

Mr. Chairman, many studies have been made in recent years pointing up the need of our schools and the action our Government should take. Notwithstanding the wholesome purposes set forth in this legislation, Mr. Chairman, we have on hand at the present time in the Office of Education the most needed data. I know that many members are wondering about the \$3 million this Congress spent only a few years ago, not considering the money spent by the various States throughout the Nation for the study of school construction needs. The people today are confronted with a school-construction problem. In Public Law 815, 81st Congress, 2d session, section 101, we find the following statement:

In order to assist the several States to inventory existing school facilities, to survey the need for the construction of additional facilities in relation to the distribution of school population, to develop State plans for school-construction programs, and to study the adequacy of State and local resources available to meet school facilities requirements, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$3 million, to remain available until expended. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to States whose applications for funds for carrying out such purposes have been approved: *Provided*, That the making of grants under this title shall not in any way commit the Congress to authorize or appropriate funds to undertake the construction of any public works so planned.

Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the enactment of that law, findings from the school facilities survey have been made available and are now complete. This survey has shown that a very large percentage of the Nation's school buildings are old and unsafe and that there is a critical need for new construction throughout the Nation. About 40 percent of the schools now in use were built before 1920 and are inadequate for pres-

ent day needs. An average of 2 out of every 5 buildings have fire and sanitation hazards. The need for new construction of public elementary and secondary school buildings is staggering. The school facilities survey revealed a need, as of September 1952, equivalent to that of a 1-story building 50 feet wide extending from New York City to San Francisco. The survey also indicates that only about one-half of the funds needed for school construction could be provided by the States and local communities through a maximum utilization of bonding and taxing capacities. It is obvious that Federal participation in financing school construction would be necessary to meet the Nation's requirements. The present crucial shortage of school facilities consists of the backlog of construction postponed during 20 years of depression and war, plus the subsequent delay of construction due to inflation and local finance problems.

This survey provides every answer to the objection raised by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for consideration of school construction. The various State departments of education throughout the Nation are vitally concerned about placing the results of this survey on a shelf to gather dust after these departments have expended State funds to help determine the needs of the schools for new public school buildings.

No one can contradict the fact that the school facilities survey, pursuant to the enactment of the law in 1950, is the most up-to-date survey ever made in the field of school construction.

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, Commissioner of Education, has not as yet made his position clear on Federal aid to school construction. We were hoping that his announced plan to testify before the Senate committee yesterday would reveal dynamic support for school construction legislation, but he failed to show up. Instead, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, asked that no program of general Federal aid be enacted until after State and White House conferences on education are held to determine the resources of localities for meeting school-construction needs. This would delay any Federal aid bill until after 1956.

The political aspects involved in these bills under consideration were recognized at the time the legislation was first discussed before the committee. However, I doubt whether any Member anticipated that the Secretary would come forth and request no action on school construction legislation until after the White House conference, especially in view of the study made pursuant to Public Law 815, 81st Congress, 2d session, 1950, which is now complete.

Now, Mr. Chairman, admitting that much good may flow from conferences, nevertheless, we are confronted with the immediate needs. We have available reliable data on school construction. We were all hopeful that the conferences suggested would not delay a school-construction program. The final White House conference in 1956, culminating in a recommendation that our Government take immediate action in the field of school construction, is too late. Why procrastinate on such a necessary and essential program when we have all the available data on hand.

Dr. Wendell P. Butler, Kentucky State superintendent of public instruction, in writing me on January 12, 1954, made this statement in connection with the school facilities survey:

The survey further shows that about 1 out of every 4 of Kentucky's children attends a 1- or 2-room school. Over half of Kentucky's children are in overcrowded classes where teachers cannot give adequate time to any child. Two out of every five of Kentucky's children attend schools with outdoor toilet facilities. Children in many districts are housed in deplorable buildings. Forty-eight percent are housed in buildings which are fire hazards, and 31 percent are in buildings that should be abandoned.

Enrollment is at an all-time high and will continue to increase in the future. Unless Federal aid for buildings is forthcoming it will be impossible for Kentucky to adequately house her school children. Despite increased local and State effort, Kentucky will continue to rank near the bottom in providing educational facilities for her children.

The superintendent of public instruction made available to me the following table, which shows the needs of various counties for a program of school-plant construction in the Seventh Congressional District in Kentucky:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, OFFICE OF EDUCATION—STATE-TO-FEDERAL REPORT ON 2D PHASE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES SURVEY

TABLE 1.—Statewide master plan for a program of school plant construction

(1)	(2)	(3)		(4)		(5)					(6)	(7)	
Projects (listed separately, but grouped according to local planning areas)	Definiteness of project (use symbols A, B, or C)	Priority or urgency of need should be ready for occupancy by (check)—		This project to be designed to accommodate—		Nature of projects and estimated cost (insert estimated cost in applicable subcolumns)					Total estimated cost of project	Size of new construction	
		(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)		(a)	(b)
		September 1955	Between September 1955 and September 1959	Grades	Pupils	Complete new plant (estimated cost exclusive of site)	New building on site now used as school center	Addition to existing building	Remodeling or rehabilitation of old building	New sites: addition to sites; improvement of sites		Number of instruction rooms	Approximate number of square feet in area of building
Breathitt County and Jackson					3,447	\$2,550,500	\$440,000	\$404,000	\$203,000	\$45,200	\$3,642,700	119	
Floyd County and Prestonburg					7,310	3,979,050	1,975,050	1,788,470	412,700	67,000	8,222,270	249	
Hazard Independent					780		396,000	351,028	166,154	3,750	916,932	26	
Elliott County					1,730	1,095,700		777,000	90,600	22,500	1,985,800	50	
Lee County					1,510	1,211,000		420,000	50,000	35,000	1,716,000	52	
Perry County					6,841	6,169,891	495,000	652,080	293,455	72,100	7,682,526	231	
Wolfe County					1,527	1,281,000		167,000	122,000	12,100	1,582,100	50	
Jenkins Independent					940	760,600	356,400	70,650		31,000	1,218,650	34	
Paintsville, Ind.					840	831,600				8,000	839,600	28	
Knott County					4,025	3,077,300	207,900	842,405	142,600	49,000	4,319,205	135	
Morgan County					1,800	769,200	891,000	247,700	208,000	20,500	2,136,400	60	
Martin County					2,190	1,410,100		627,630	110,000	26,500	2,174,230	75	
Magoffin County					2,580	1,704,100	267,300	824,200	64,500	26,500	2,886,600	88	
Letcher County					6,080	5,079,400	297,000	983,400	90,500	47,000	6,497,300	206	
Johnson County and Van Lear					3,360	1,471,000	949,900	960,325	22,500	37,500	3,441,225	112	
Total					44,960	31,390,441	6,275,550	9,115,888	1,976,009	503,650	49,261,538	1,515	

Similar information is now available to all Congressmen and to the public. This survey, at that time, had not been completed in Pike County, Ky. The needs in Pike County are best expressed in a letter received from Claude Farley, superintendent of Pike County schools. The pertinent excerpts from the letter are as follows:

MAY 10, 1954.

In looking over this survey, which was compiled rather carefully by Amos Runyon, who, as you know, is a very conservative person, out of all the buildings which the Pike County Board of Education owns, housing 23,000 children, only four are fire-resistant buildings, 9 are semifire-resistant buildings, and 157 are combustible buildings.

Continuing with this survey, we have in this county 84 1-classroom buildings and 70 2- or 3-classroom buildings. Two-thirds of these 1- and 2-room buildings could be consolidated into large modern buildings if we had the money with which to do so. If the Federal Government should grant us \$12 million with which to build school buildings alone, we could easily spend every dime of it and still have large areas unserved.

I do not know of a greater service the Federal Government could render to those areas of the country which are suffering from an economic crisis such as ours is, than to give them money to erect consolidated schools. We have many of our children housed in frame buildings which are not safe, and because of the small working budget which we have, we shall not be able in this generation to replace these fire hazards.

We shall appreciate anything which you and your committee can do to help alleviate this awful situation among our children here in Pike County.

CLAUDE FARLEY,
Superintendent, Pike County Schools,
Pikeville, Ky.

The necessity for Federal aid is well explained in Mr. Farley's letter. In view of existing economic conditions we cannot afford to further postpone and procrastinate.

Mr. Chairman, on January 3, 1953, I introduced H. R. 544, an emergency public-school plant facilities act, authorizing an appropriation of \$500 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for each of the 2 succeeding years to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of urgently needed plant facilities for elementary, secondary, and vocational schools.

The distribution formula contained in H. R. 544 would allot Federal funds on the basis of relative needs of the States. Under this formula, the Federal funds would be apportioned to the States in direct proportion to their school-age population and in inverse ratio to their per capita-income payments. Thus these would be an adjustment of the Federal allotment upward to 60 percent of the total cost of the construction program for the State with the lowest per capita income, and an adjustment downward to 40 percent of the total cost of the construction program for the State with the highest per capita income. The Federal allotments to the other States would range, according to their per capita incomes, between the two extremes. In other words, the richest State would be expected to pay 60 percent of the total cost of school construction within that State, but the poorest State would be expected to pay only 40 percent of the total cost of school construction within its borders.

I, like numerous other Members, have no pride in authorship of school-construction legislation, but we feel that this Congress must act now and authorize and appropriate an amount sufficient to get this needed program underway in accordance with the recommendations of the school-facilities survey authorized in 1950, and which is now complete.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLT. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] mentioned my bill, H. R. 7601. Since he would not yield, I would like to say that this conference will be held in the fall of 1954 or by the summer of 1955, and not 1956. I will be very happy to answer any question in that respect.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. It was discussed in the committee that the White House conference would be held in 1956. Is that statement correct? I say that in the committee the discussion was that the conference would be held in 1956 and the State conferences would be held in 1955.

Mr. HOLT. Just as I stated before, the White House conference is to be held in 1954 and 1955. I did not say 1956.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield to my very good friend the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether he feels that expenditures of money are improper in a year when Members of Congress or the President of the United States is up for election. Is it his suggestion that he would be opposed to the expenditure of money for good educational purposes if anybody was running for office, whether it was 1954 or 1956?

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to say to my distinguished friend the gentleman from New Jersey that I am not opposed to the expenditure of this sum of money for this purpose in an election year. But I think it was planned and the discussion was in the committee that the White House conference would be held in 1956 and not in 1955.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

Mr. Chairman, before beginning my presentation I would like to pay great tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and to my colleagues on both sides who have worked on this bill so diligently.

I assure the gentleman from Kentucky that his remarks undoubtedly will be noted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and that they will make every effort to speed up the program. I am inclined to believe that the program is scheduled, as outlined by the gentleman from California [Mr. Holt], to begin to roll at the end of this year; that the people responsible will carry through their State conferences, and that they will hold the meetings much sooner than indicated by the gentleman from Kentucky.

To repeat, I believe it is scheduled to roll at the end of this year and that the people in the White House will have their conference next year, which certainly is not an election year. I think it is a shame that the gentleman should suggest politics in this worthwhile project. This gives me an excellent opportunity to pay high tribute to the Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, and the able Undersecretary, Mr. Rockefeller. They have done more in a year and a half to unify and to present a proper program to the American people in this important field than has been done in the past 25. They are typical examples of the fine, high-type person brought into the administration by President Eisenhower.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I think in answer to my colleague on the committee from Kentucky I should say this, that the passage of H. R. 9040, which we are considering now, would have nothing to do with the postponement of any construction bill.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman is quite right.

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman is referring to another bill which has not come up yet.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Certainly, and I think this is an excellent opportunity to point out to the membership of the House that we are, today, considering three companion bills. We are now talking about H. R. 9040, but the three companion bills go hand in hand. They are all part of President Eisenhower's legislative program; part of his attempt as set forth in his state of the Union message and in the budget message to present the people of the United States with a proper health and educational program. My friends who have spoken

against this bill have long cried out that they, the good Democrats, are not only in support of the President's program but also that they alone are putting it through. A vote will tell the tale. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Are they with this fine human program or not? This is a true Eisenhower or administration project, and one that should be nonpartisan to the end.

All of us are willing to grant the significance of education. We know that America's security and the hopes of the free world depend on the character and the ideals of our young people. The complexity of today's world calls for deeper understanding, for greater competence, and broader knowledge than ever before. And that goes right down into the heart of the very school districts themselves. True, those school districts are self-contained and should be self-contained, and education should come from the school districts themselves. But, as I pointed out in answer to the question of the gentleman from Georgia, the Federal Government should be ready and willing to help when called upon. I believe this is the most important thing that should be stressed here today. And that problem not only covers the three bills we are discussing, but covers the whole range and understanding of the Federal approach to education.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are discussing and have been discussing and to which we should devote our attention at this time, H. R. 9040, sets forth the establishment of a cooperative research program. It would carry out the President's budget message recommendation which I now quote:

That legislation be enacted which will enable the Office of Education to join its resources with those of State and local agencies, universities, and other educational organizations for the conduct of cooperative research and surveys in demonstration projects.

I think it should be made clear to the membership of the House that at this time the Office of Education is not, I repeat, not specifically authorized to enter into projects involving the joint expenditure of these funds with local groups. All that this bill would do, in addition to the items set forth in the report, is the granting of this authority. Basically what this bill would do is to allow joint expenditure of funds.

Cooperative research arrangements of the sort proposed in this bill have shown great returns, principally in the field of public education, for every dollar spent. We on the committee are convinced that such arrangements can make equally valuable contributions in the field of education where the need for research is particularly great.

One important advantage of the approach proposed in this bill is that while by increasing and improving the research services that are available, the bill would not add substantially to the research staff of the Office of Education.

In conclusion, I urge you to vote not only for this bill, but all these bills. The State and White House conferences on education would foster a nationwide understanding of the problems of education and mobilize resources for local, State, and Federal action. Together these three bills guarantee a constructive and well-balanced program in the field of education.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, not long prior to becoming a Member of this body I was engaged in the job of keeping school. I cannot say that I taught too much school, but I kept school for a while. I do not recall a single instance in my school keeping experience when I required any aid or advice from any bureaucrat in Washington. The biggest thing I always stood in need of was some financing. It is somewhat amazing, to say the least, here this afternoon, to hear members of a party which, according to the way I read the papers and listened to the radio in the last campaign, proposed to rededicate itself to the principle called States' rights—I say it is amazing to me for members of that party to be proponents of this measure. And it is even more amazing to me to hear some of my good southern friends who have made long and loud noises through the years on this question of State's right, come into the Well of this House and suggest that they require the advice and counsel of some Federal bureaucrat in order to help solve their problems in their home Southern States.

Since I have been a Member of this House I have had occasion to note many instances where the Members were asked to provide hobbyhorses one at a time for various Federal bureaucrats, but this is the first time in my experience where this House has been asked to provide three hobbyhorses for the same Federal official at the same fell swoop, almost.

I refuse to stand here and admit that the good people whom I have the honor to represent in the great State of Georgia are incapable of handling their educational affairs without the advice and counsel of a Federal bureaucrat. To me this bill and the two that will immediately succeed it are no more than insidious efforts on the part of the professional bleeding-heart liberals in this Government to take over lock, stock, and barrel the problem of public education in this country.

Mr. Chairman, it will be a sad day when people at the State level will have to have their curriculum and all other matters having to do with their education dictated by someone in Washington.

I do not want the remarks I am making here by any stretch of the most fertile imagination to be construed as being opposed to the providing of the most adequate possible facilities for the education of the American children, but I refuse to be seduced with the idea that someone in Washington, after having had the advice and counsel of some contracting agency, can better solve the educational problems in my State than

the people in my State who are already charged with that responsibility.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Does not the gentleman also think that our State along with other States might be able to harmonize such social agencies with our schools as we think should be harmonized?

Mr. WHEELER. I think that is a rhetorical question, but I am glad to add my affirmative answer to the question.

(Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, which would permit spending \$400,000 by the Federal Government for the purpose of gathering information on such points as the following:

EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH STUDIES

There are many areas in the field of education in which cooperative research holds out great promise for increased economy and efficiency. Some examples of studies which might be undertaken under this cooperative research program are as follows:

- (a) Reducing the cost of educational facilities.
- (b) Improving business procedures in schools and colleges.
- (c) Reorganizing school districts for maximum efficiency.
- (d) Attracting more young people into teaching, engineering, and other shortage professions.
- (e) Improving teaching methods.
- (f) Developing closer ties with parents and citizens.
- (g) Placing community health and social agencies in proper perspective with school programs.

Time will not permit me to go into details of what I think about the bill. However, having spent 17 years in educational work, including 2 terms as a school administrator, I feel that I know something of the needs of our educational system.

Twenty years ago the State of Mississippi knew more about the needs of education than what you are seeking to find out under the provisions of this bill. The trouble with many States is the lack of funds for doing the job with which they are already familiar. I was surprised to see the recommended reduction in vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped last year and also a reduction in appropriations for vocational education. This year the administration has recommended a reduction in appropriations for vocational education which reaches every community in this country. We have our organizations of schoolteachers and educators. We have our National Educational Association and State department of education, and so forth, which do not cost the Federal Government 1 dime. These sources can furnish more authentic information than can be obtained in 2 years under a bill which would only duplicate surveys

already made. I cannot understand how any person who knows anything about schoolwork could come before the committee and advocate legislation of this kind. I would like to ask the committee if anyone could tell me how many additional Federal employees will be needed to carry on this survey. Can you tell me?

Mr. McCONNELL. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi, I would say none.

Mr. WINSTEAD. None? You will add some personnel either under this bill, or under 1 of the other 2 bills to follow this, which bring about the need for additional personnel. You will subsidize institutions to work up information which is already available. Four hundred thousand dollars is only the beginning, if this legislation is passed. You will see Members of Congress coming in here year after year advocating increased appropriations in order to reach out into the rural schools and high schools and junior colleges. There is no end to what you will do with this bill whether you know it or not.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. I congratulate the gentleman upon his splendid position. I join with him in saying that if we have any extra money, for heaven's sake let us give it for the purposes of vocational education.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I thank the gentleman, who is one of the most able Members of this House. I want to call your attention to the fact that the Federal Government in 1950 spent over \$100 million on research in our educational institutions. In 1952 we spent \$341 million for research, largely through the Department of Defense. My good friend spoke about atomic research. All this type research is going on now—research in physical, biological, medical, engineering, and other technical sciences. Time will not permit us to go into all the details of this bill and its possible effects. Just read the bill. I ask the membership to think of it seriously. You say it will encourage young people to go into the teaching profession. How are you going to do that? By appropriating and spending \$400,000 to duplicate surveys and finding the need? We had better give consideration to meeting existing needs for buildings and facilities, as well as increased pay for teachers. We do not have to appropriate \$400,000 to determine why the people of this country have left the teaching profession.

This bill, and the two bills to follow, should be defeated, thereby saving millions of dollars which could be better used on existing needs.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I direct this question to the gentleman from Pennsylvania: Does this bill provide any authorization for funds for school construction?

Mr. McCONNELL. No funds are authorized in this bill for school construction?

Mr. HARVEY. During the course of your hearings, was the position made clear with regard to whether there would be duplication of the survey of school facilities which was completed just about a year ago?

Mr. McCONNELL. I anticipate no duplication of the survey. In fact, this has to do with research in specific phases, for instances, in the types of building materials or facilities and things of that sort rather than a general survey of the school situation in regard to buildings. That survey has been completed. I see no reason why it would be repeated.

Mr. HARVEY. In other words, this is another and different field than that of an actual school survey with regard to facilities needed?

Mr. McCONNELL. This is purely a research proposition. The Office of Education has the authority now to give advice if they are asked for it in any school district in the country. Of course, they may not have the answers to some of the questions. If they find they do not, instead of conducting the research themselves to get the answer to the question, they can enter into co-operative arrangements with colleges, universities, or any State departments of education to obtain that information by research.

Mr. HARVEY. Then this is primarily an effort to coordinate the efforts of research in the field of education.

Mr. McCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. To clarify the question and to answer some of the irrelevant questions that have been here presented, may I state that one of the features of this bill is, for example, that it would allow any university anywhere in any part of the United States to go into partnership with the Federal Government to obtain the benefit of the fine research done by the Federal Government. For example, at the end of Long Island there is a Federal hoof-and-mouth-disease laboratory. At the present time, as I understand the law, universities are not in a position to go into special partnership of this kind with the Federal Government. They cannot farm out this kind of research. This bill would allow this anywhere in the United States, and particularly in some backward areas of the country where it is badly needed.

Mr. HARVEY. Then, would this be operated similar to the way the State agricultural experiment stations are now coordinating their activities with the Bureau of Research in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. That is quite correct. That is my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side. By way of closing the discussion, I might say that when this bill was being considered in the committee I raised some questions about it, and through the action of my good friend the gentleman

from Montana [Mr. METCALF], one of my major objections to the bill was removed. That was that we had made provision for entering into contracts with non-profit organizations. I did not want to put the Department of Education in a position where they could enter into a contract with a group like the Facts Forum put on by the millionaire oil operator in Texas. So most of the objections to the legislation were removed when we struck that nonprofit provision out of the bill. My only other thought in connection with it was that it might be used as an excuse for not promptly considering legislation in the field, and on the promise of our very able chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] that he was proceeding immediately with those hearings, I am not registering any objection to the legislation.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, in the remaining half minute, I think I would like to make this statement very definitely:

I am opposed to Federal control of our schools. I think the control should belong where it traditionally has been—that is, in the local areas of our Government, and not in the Federal Government.

By no stretch of the imagination could this be interpreted to mean control of our schools. The Office of Education was not established by me. It was not established by this Congress. It is in existence. It has the right to make research today and to send out its findings all over the United States. All we are saying is that we prefer to do it in a more efficient manner and not build up a big bureau in Washington.

I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have discussed this matter may have the right to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable the Office of Education more effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges, and State educational departments for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as probably may have been gathered by some of my colleagues already, I stand in need of further advice on this bill. I want, therefore, to ask 2 or 3 more questions about it.

On page 2 of the report, under the heading "Examples of Research Studies," I am somewhat amazed at subparagraph (a). It seems that this whole \$400,000 fund to be spent by a Federal bureau is aimed at reducing the cost of educational facilities. I have been hanging around here for 8 years, and I have failed to see a single instance where the Federal Gov-

ernment or any agency thereof has ever been successful in this particular regard, that is, effecting the reduction of the cost in any particular endeavor regardless of the field.

I would like to know how it can possibly be concluded that the activities of any Federal agency costing either \$100,000 or \$400,000 can be expected to result in the reduction of the cost of any program.

The next one, subsection (b), reads: "Improving Business Procedures in Schools and Colleges."

The same objection and criticism that I raised on subsection (a) applies with even more force to subsection (b). I do not know of any Federal agency that has ever attained any real degree of note in the field of improving business procedures in any particular activity.

Now, subsection (d): "Attracting More Young People Into Teaching, Engineering, and Other Shortage Professions."

I can tell you how you can attract more people into the teaching profession without its costing you a penny. I know, for I have been a teacher. I know that an increase in salaries paid to school teachers will do more to attract young people into this field than anything else you could do.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. I would like to say to my good friend, and he is my good friend, from Georgia—he and I have voted alike on some occasions—

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but you have not always been as wrong as you are on this.

Mr. McCONNELL. Maybe the gentleman has not been as wrong before as he is at this time also.

I would like to say that in a district of which I happen to know, in particular with this subparagraph 1, reducing the cost of education facilities, that district has hired a private firm to advise them by study as to the best method of handling certain types of construction in their school building program. It will be well to have that information not only in this one particular area but scattered throughout the country.

The gentleman has stated that he once was a school teacher. I would make the wager right now—I make the statement right now—that the gentleman could not advise this particular school district as to the best materials to use in their school facilities.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not claim to be able to advise them on that particular score. I just advise them as to how they can attract more young people into the teaching profession.

I hope they get all the information available on the particular question the gentleman raised, but I do not see the need for using some Federal agency to do it.

Let me hurry along to the next one. The next one is subsection (e): "Improving Teaching Methods."

This I think is the crux of this whole bill, teaching methods. That is the most direct method of gaining control in the educational field in this country.

The next one, subsection (f): "Developing Closer Ties With Parents and Citizens."

That leads to a great big question mark in my mind: Where do you draw the line between parents and citizens?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHEELER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHEELER. Do you mean that this research is to proceed in the field of sociology and set up sociological standards so that there will be a better understanding between those citizens who are not parents and those who are?

There is another question that I inadvertently overlooked, and I refer to subsection (c), reorganizing school districts for maximum efficiency. Since when have we become willing—we States' righters, we people who are vociferous and as articulate as possible champions of local autonomy—to have some Federal agency come down into south Georgia or south Alabama or Kentucky and tell us how we should reorganize our school districts? I thought that was a problem that came properly within the purview of the local subdivision of this Republic.

Then the last one, placing community help and social agencies in proper perspective with school programs. My very distinguished and able colleague from an adjoining district to mine, Mr. FORRESTER, has already pointed out what I consider to be a very valid objection to this particular field of activity.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Does the distinguished gentleman from Georgia feel that this is a States rights issue and that a vote on it would be interpreted accordingly?

Mr. WHEELER. Unless a quorum is present when the vote comes, we will find out who is for States rights and who is not. I so interpret it.

Mr. AYRES. Does the gentleman from Georgia identify himself with those who are in the States rights column?

Mr. WHEELER. Definitely so, and I refuse to sell my position for a measly \$5,000 which will be offered to my State as a price for a mess of pottage in the next bill.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am not surprised that that question should be asked. The gentleman, and I am sure the gentleman's record will show that he is indeed a States righter. I believe they all know I am a States righter. I would like to ask them to let us see a little States rights percolate down south of the Mason-Dixon line.

Mr. WHEELER. I have been somewhat amazed, I may say to the gentleman, at those people who say they are for States rights but invariably mean they are opposed to the so-called civil-rights program. If you will offer them a little monetary pottage in the way of Federal funds as a gimme or come-on,

they forget all about their qualms on the States-rights question.

(Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "annually."

Page 1, line 12, after the word "sums", insert: "not to exceed \$400,000 in any fiscal year."

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered because of fears on the part of some Members of the House that this might turn into a Federal dragon which could swallow a lot of people and do a lot of things. There is no intent on the part of anybody to cause this bill to do that. In fact, the intent of the author of the bill, and I am sure the intent of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is just the antithesis of that. The \$400,000 will undoubtedly be adequate for many years to come for this particular piece of legislation, and I see no reason why it should ever be increased within the foreseeable future.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of talk here today about States rights. I regard myself as a States rights man, too. I believe that the fundamental liberties guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States should remain as they were when they were written. If this bill were, in my opinion, anything but in furtherance of States rights, I assure you I would not have introduced it.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the bill just a little bit. This bill provides that instead of setting up a research organization within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, here in Washington, that the information required by the Department be furnished to it by the States themselves, the educational institutions, the State departments of public instruction, the institutions in the field; in other words, not that some great bureau be set up here which might, in truth, become a great Federal dragon at some time. This, then, certainly is a bill which anybody who believes in States rights should endorse and approve.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. If this information is going to be furnished by the States,

why send it to Washington and then send it back to the States?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The only reason that is done is because there has to be some sort of a clearinghouse for this information. In other words, you cannot have 48 different States crossing lines of communications back and forth and do a very efficient job of evaluating the information.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I do not question the gentleman, but the point I make is that we can get the same information you ask for, it must come to the Department of Education here, and instead of subsidizing them to send it here, they already have this information and it will not cost the Government anything to get it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is assuming that we know what information we want or know what information we are going to have to get. I think the function of any clearinghouse is to evaluate the information, to see if it is adequate. If it needs to be expanded or if more needs to be known about this particular type of information, then we should go out in the field and get somebody to perfect it.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I understood the gentleman to say that the Department does not want to take on additional burdens, but they can obtain this information under the present law from the various States, and if they need further legislation, let them prove their case.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. There are people in the Department now engaged in research, and as I understand, their staff is adequate to handle this other piece of research in the Department.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Does not the gentleman think they could get from the State organizations this information without having to spend \$400,000 to get it?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will say to the gentleman that it might be difficult to decide which State organization is best adapted to do a particular piece of research, unless we have some sort of clearinghouse here to allocate and farm out the work. I think the main difference between the gentleman's position and mine is that he feels that all we have to do is to ask for this information and you can get it. That is true. But you also may have to have the information boiled down and get other facts which are not now apparent, or which must be perfected. This would be done by taking a State university or other educational institution or system which is best adapted to develop the subject and give it enough money to go ahead and by research furnish the answers which are required.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The State departments in the various States, the universities and colleges could go out and do this work without being subsidized.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman says "subsidized." I say "contract." There is nothing wrong with contracting with States.

Mr. WINSTEAD. If you need information that your report says you want, you could get more from the rural areas than any big capitals or city adminis-

trations, and when you start expanding out to every junior college and every high school, your \$400,000 will not scratch the surface.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I interpret the gentleman's position correctly, I suggest to the gentleman that he introduce a bill to abolish the Office of Education.

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. If there is a State that decides they do not wish the service that your bill would provide, could they refuse to accept it?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Absolutely. The whole thing is on a voluntary basis. No State need accept the information; no State or institution need do the research work unless it desires to do so.

Mr. AYRES. Then, if there are gentlemen from those States who are afraid that their States might be involved, all they would have to do would be to say they do not want it; it is strictly on a voluntary basis.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman, and I wish to go on record as supporting the bill.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I think it is to be regretted that this has become a States rights question, because this obviously makes the States rights Members feel that, if their school district or university asks for the advantages of reducing the cost of educational facilities or any of the eight points set forth here, that they cannot go to the Federal Government and ask for assistance, which I think would be very beneficial and helpful to them. They are apparently opposed to improving their educational systems. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCONNELL. I think the most accurate observation the gentleman has made in connection with some of the opposition that seems to have developed on the other side is that they should abolish the Office of Education. That would get at the thing to which they object.

The Department now has the right to make research, to conduct studies, and to make the results available all over the United States to any State that wishes it or to any district that wishes it. All this bill does is, instead of building up a big bureau, it gives the Office of Education the right to conduct research on various subjects that they feel that they do not know enough about in order to get that information into a cen-

tral office where it will be available to everybody.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the remarks that have been made. I want to be very fair. I am a supporter of this bill. I rose a minute ago but did not have sufficient opportunity to comment. I would like to answer the questions of the gentleman from Georgia on this matter.

One of the provisions of this bill does have to do with reorganizing school districts for maximum efficiency. We went through that about 5 years ago in the State of Illinois. I cannot imagine any more difficult situation than we had during those 2 years in which there was litigation up and down the State, causing everybody great deal of trouble. In the end we did work out a pretty good system for the State of Illinois. Now, that was done some 60 years after the last reorganization had been made of school districts in Illinois. But if we had had this kind of law in Illinois to which the superintendent of public instruction in 1947 and 1948 could have turned, he would have been much helped. He could have turned to the University of Illinois and asked for a survey in conjunction with the Office of Education here in Washington. This survey would have been the guidepost that helped to determine how you were going to reorganize our school districts in Illinois. And in second place we could have done this thing without causing too much difficulty between school districts.

I believe my good friend and our colleague, Dr. McVey, who is an expert on educational questions in Illinois, just told me that Illinois had the most number of school districts of any State in the Nation. Now I believe we have a State that has perhaps the fewest number of school districts—that is of any large State.

The law has worked. The reorganization has worked well, but I do believe we could have avoided many of the pitfalls which we went through in that reorganization had we had this kind of study made first. I do not believe there is any way it could have compromised the question of States' rights as far as Illinois is concerned.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. As the gentleman was so articulately pointing out, the problems that were raised in his State relative to the districting of school districts or the redivision of school districts, I could not help raising in my own mind the question as to why they could not have handled that problem within the great State of Illinois, without having that problem channeled through some Federal agency.

In other words, could not the Illinois State legislature have appropriated whatever funds were necessary for any survey that was needed and then utilized the results of that survey?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that is another way of doing it. I think the gen-

tleman has made a point. I find nothing wrong with what he has said. I do believe that this bill is the advanced and best way to do it, by taking advantage of whatever information we have on a national scale. In other words, you are getting here in one place, the Office of Education, through which will be channeled the results of the surveys made in all the States.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Assuming then that it could have been done at the State level, this pending bill to my mind is no more than an effort to shift the responsibility to a Federal agency.

Mr. SPRINGER. Perhaps, as the gentleman has said, that is true. I think it is a question of whether it should be shifted or not. I do believe there is merit in getting this joinder of the efforts of all the 48 States in the study of a particular problem such as you have here. In the Office of Education you have the coordination of the whole effort, we will say, on the reorganization of school districts which is facing us all today. I think this plan has a great deal of merit. It is an advanced procedure over the one which the gentleman is supporting, and which I think the State of Georgia or Illinois or any other State could follow it, in fairness to his constituents. It is just my personal opinion that it can be done better this way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I fail to understand how this Federal agency here could have stopped the friction between the school districts out in the State of Illinois without giving the Federal agency authority which it never should have.

Mr. SPRINGER. I disagree with the gentleman to this extent. In the first place, I do not think it could stop any friction there was out there—except insofar as the experience gained from a survey could have helped.

Mr. GROSS. I think that was the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SPRINGER. No, I beg the gentleman's pardon, it was not. What I said was that there would be an agency to which the State or the people in the legislature could go to gain some experience. In other words, to have a contract made with the University of Illinois which would have made a study of the situation in the State of Illinois. This survey would then have been available through 1 agency to all the 48 States which might have a similar problem.

(Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I wish to ask a question of the author of the bill. In line 7 of the bill appear the words "jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges, and

State educational departments." Do the words "State educational departments" refer also to universities and colleges, or do you intend that this shall apply to private educational institutions and State institutions?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It would be the intent of the committee that any university or college could come under this bill. If the contract is made with a State educational department, it would presuppose that some institution within the State educational department would actually do the work. In other words, no contract would be made with the individual school in the gentleman's district or in my district, it would be made with the State educational department of the State of Kansas or the State of Arizona.

Mr. FORRESTER. I believe that question has been answered.

Mr. Chairman, I rise here because of the fact that I think they have injected a little issue in here that really should not have been brought in. I was somewhat amused that one of the proponents of this bill merely incidentally and by way of passing asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] whether or not he was a States rights man. The gentleman from Georgia said he was a States rights man. Then all at once we find that we have a States rights issue that they have made. In other words, a strawman.

It reminds me of the barker at the fair who was crying out, "All right, all right, everybody, just for 10 cents, one dime, one-tenth part of a dollar, see the sword that Balaam had."

A preacher came along and said to him, "You old faker, you know good and well Balaam did not have a sword. What he said was, 'I would I did have a sword'."

That did not stop the barker. He cried, "All right, all right, everybody, just for 10 cents, one dime, one-tenth part of a dollar, see the sword that Balaam wished he had."

We do not have any States rights issue here. You are just wishing you did have one.

I want to tell you what my objection to this bill is. My objection to this bill is based upon the fact that the day before we adjourned in the last session of the Congress, you were asking that the debt limit be raised when we owed \$275 billion. I have tried to vote for economy on all sides, but this is just simply the spending of from \$100,000 to \$400,000 that you can absolutely dispense with at the present time.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Do you believe we should start economizing at the expense of the educational system of this country?

Mr. FORRESTER. No, sir; not at the expense of the educational system, but I believe you should not pass a bill such as this. You are talking about cutting funds for vocational education. Do you think this is a good time to talk about that when if there is any kind of education in this country that you ought to

be spending money on, it is in the field of vocational education where a boy or girl is taught to work with their hands because just as sure as you are living, sir, the time is going to come in this country when a man is going to have to do some work.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I expect to vote with the gentleman for vocational education.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am going to vote for vocational education whether the gentleman does or not, but in the meantime I am going to try my best to help you gentlemen carry out your campaign promise which was that you were not going to spend any money you could keep from spending without injuring the people of the United States. This is one thing that you can safely pass over until we are certain that we have a budget which is in balance.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LeCOMPTE, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, pursuant to House Resolution 531, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will continue to count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 296, nays 55, answered "present" 2, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—296

Adair	George	Murray
Addonizio	Golden	Natcher
Allen, Calif.	Goodwin	Neal
Allen, Ill.	Gordon	Nelson
Andersen,	Granahan	Nicholson
H. Carl	Gubser	Norblad
Andresen,	Hagen, Calif.	Oakman
August H.	Hagen, Minn.	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Hale	O'Brien, Mich.
Angell	Haley	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arends	Halleck	O'Hara, Ill.
Aspinall	Hand	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Harden	O'Nell
Bailey	Harrison, Nebr.	Osmers
Baker	Harrison, Wyo.	Ostertag
Bates	Hart	Patman
Battle	Harvey	Patten
Beamer	Hays, Ark.	Patterson
Becker	Hays, Ohio	Perkins
Belcher	Heseltun	Pfost
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Phillips
Bentley	Hiestand	Pillion
Betts	Hill	Poage
Baltnik	Hillelson	Poff
Boggs	Hillings	Polk
Boland	Hinshaw	Powell
Bolling	Hoeven	Price
Bolton,	Hoffman, Ill.	Priest
Frances P.	Hollifield	Prouty
Bolton,	Holmes	Rabaut
Oliver P.	Holt	Radwan
Bonin	Holtzman	Rains
Bosch	Hope	Ray
Bramblett	Horan	Rayburn
Bray	Hosmer	Reams
Brooks, Tex.	Howell	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Hruska	Reed, Ill.
Brownson	Hunter	Rees, Kans.
Broyhill	Hyde	Rhodes, Ariz.
Buchanan	Jackson	Rhodes, Pa.
Burdick	James	Riehlman
Busbey	Jarman	Robison, Ky.
Bush	Javits	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Jenkins	Rogers, Colo.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Campbell	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney
Canfield	Johnson, Wis.	Sadlak
Cannon	Jonas, Ill.	St. George
Carnahan	Jonas, N. C.	Saylor
Carrigg	Jones, Ala.	Schenck
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Scott
Chenoweth	Karsten, Mo.	Scrivner
Chiferfield	Kean	Scudder
Chudoff	Kearney	Seely-Brown
Church	Kearns	Selden
Cole, Mo.	Kelly, N. Y.	Shafer
Condon	Keogh	Shelley
Cooley	Killburn	Short
Coon	Kilday	Siemlinski
Cooper	Kling, Pa.	Sikes
Corbett	Kirwan	Simpson, Ill.
Cotton	Kluczynski	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Knox	Small
Cretella	Krueger	Smith, Wis.
Crumpacker	Laird	Springer
Cunningham	Lane	Staggers
Curtis, Mass.	Lanham	Stauffer
Curtis, Mo.	LeCompte	Steed
Curtis, Nebr.	Lesinski	Sullivan
Dague	Lipscomb	Talle
Davis, Wis.	Long	Teague
Dawson, Utah	Lovre	Thompson,
Delaney	Lucas	Mich.
Dempsey	McCarthy	Thompson, Tex.
Derounian	McConnell	Thornberry
Devereux	McCulloch	Tollefson
D'Ewart	McDonough	Trimble
Dodd	McGregor	Utt
Dolliver	McIntire	Van Zandt
Dondero	McVey	Vorys
Dorn, N. Y.	Machrowicz	Vursell
Doyle	Mack, Ill.	Wainwright
Durham	Mack, Wash.	Wampler
Eberhart	Madden	Warburton
Edmondson	Magnuson	Watts
Elliott	Mahon	Wharton
Ellsworth	Mallard	Wickersham
Evins	Matthews	Widnall
Fallon	Meador	Wier
Felghan	Merrill	Wigglesworth
Fenton	Morrow	Williams, N. J.
Fernandez	Metcalf	Williams, N. Y.
Fino	Miller, Calif.	Withrow
Fogarty	Miller, Md.	Wolverton
Ford	Miller, Nebr.	Yates
Frazier	Miller, N. Y.	Yorty
Frelinghuysen	Morano	Young
Friedel	Morgan	Younger
Fulton	Moss	Zablocki
Gamble	Multer	
Garmatz	Mumma	

NAYS—55

Abbott	Gathings	Regan
Abernethy	Gentry	Riley
Alexander	Gross	Rivers
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Robeson, Va.
Bonner	Harris	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Harrison, Va.	Smith, Kans.
Brooks, La.	Hébert	Taber
Brown, Ga.	Jones, N. C.	Thomas
Budge	Landrum	Thompson, La.
Burleson	Lantaff	Tuck
Colmer	McMillan	Van Pelt
Davis, Ga.	Marshall	Vinson
Dies	Mills	Wheeler
Donovan	Norrell	Whitten
Dorn, S. C.	O'Hara, Minn.	Williams, Miss.
Dowdy	Passman	Willis
Flisher	Pilcher	Winstead
Forrester	Preston	
Gary	Reed, N. Y.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

McCormack Miller, Kans.

NOT VOTING—81

Albert	Donohue	Morrison
Ashmore	Engle	Moulder
Ayres	Fine	Pelly
Barden	Forand	Philbin
Barrett	Fountain	Richards
Bender	Gavin	Roberts
Bentsen	Graham	Rogers, Fla.
Berry	Grant	Roosevelt
Bishop	Green	Scherer
Bowler	Gregory	Secrest
Boykin	Gwinn	Sheehan
Buckley	Heller	Sheppard
Byrd	Herlong	Shuford
Camp	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Miss.
Carlyle	Ikard	Smith, Va.
Cederberg	Judd	Spence
Chatham	Keating	Stringfellow
Chelf	Kee	Sutton
Clardy	Kelley, Pa.	Taylor
Clevenger	Kersten, Wis.	Velde
Cole, N. Y.	King, Calif.	Walter
Crosser	Klein	Welchel
Davis, Tenn.	Latham	Westland
Dawson, Ill.	Lyle	Wilson, Calif.
Deane	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Dingell	Mason	Wilson, Tex.
Dollinger	Mollohan	Wolcott

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Graham for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bishop with Mr. Byrd.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan with Mr. Molohan.

Mr. Keating with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Pelly with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. King of California.

Mr. Gavin with Mr. Chatham.

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Heller.

Mr. Clardy with Mr. Klein.

Mr. Judd with Mr. Dollinger.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Fine.

Mr. Bender with Mr. Donohue.

Mr. Sheehan with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Engel.

Mr. Mason with Mr. Secrest.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Shuford.

Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Ashmore.

Mr. Ayres with Mr. Bowler.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Camp.

Mr. Latham with Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Deane.

Mr. Wilson of California with Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Scherer with Mr. Green.

Mr. Gwinn with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Forand.

Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Velde with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Westland with Mr. Fountain.

Mr. Berry with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MILLER of Kansas changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAHAM. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of California) was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

OSCAR F. BROWN

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 235.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 1769) for the relief of Oscar F. Brown. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following corrections:

Page 1, line 5, after "to" insert "Mrs."

Page 1, line 8, after "sustained" insert "by her husband, Oscar F. Brown." Page 1, line 10, after the figures "1942" strike out the colon and insert "Oscar F. Brown died subsequent to the passage of this bill by the House of Representatives."

Amend the title so as to read: "For the relief of Mrs. Oscar F. Brown."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 532) providing for the consideration of H. R. 7434, a bill to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7434) to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

At this time I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 532, making in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7434) to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education.

House Resolution 532, Mr. Speaker, provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7434, has been amended by the Committee on Education and Labor so that it now specifies that for the purposes outlined in this bill no more than \$200,000 may be authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year.

The bill itself, Mr. Speaker, would authorize the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Education for the purpose of making available to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the advice of lay citizens concerning the difficult problems in the field of education.

This committee, as I understand it, would be composed of nine members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and these members of the committee may not either hold an office in, or be in the employ of the Federal Government. Each member of the committee will hold office for a period of 3 years.

The report of the Committee on Education and Labor outlines the types of problems which this proposed Committee on Education might study. Among the problems which could conceivably be the subject matter for investigation are: First, the relationship between drop outs in school and juvenile delinquency; second, the problem of illiteracy, particularly in relation to selective-service rejections; third, special instruction for exceptional children—handicapped children; fourth, educating the children of migratory workers, and fifth, the education of teachers.

H. R. 7434, Mr. Speaker, does not specify the period of time during which this National Advisory Committee on Education shall function, since it is felt that the problem of education is a continuing one.

The National Committee on Education, according to the report on the bill, would be required to appraise the most pressing problems in the field of educa-

tion; to decide which appear to be most capable of solution and to determine in what order the various problems shall be attacked, and to advise the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding the progress being made.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules felt that the House membership should have the opportunity to consider this bill, and for this reason we granted a rule on H. R. 7434. I hope that the House will see fit to adopt this resolution so that we may consider H. R. 7434.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who is opposed to the rule or the bill itself.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to disillusion my distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], but I am under the impression there was considerable opposition in the Rules Committee itself to reporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to continue to oppose this for the same reasons that I stated in opposition to the other bill, the companion bill this morning; namely, that I see no good purpose to be gained by the enactment of such legislation; that it is another increase in bureaucracy. I do not like to needle my friends on the right, I am sure they realize that, but my friends have told us so much about these bureaucracies in the past that we had a right to expect there would be a cessation of them rather than an increase, with the change in administration.

But we have three bills here today, and I have not found anybody yet, I will say to the distinguished gentleman, who was enthusiastic about any of them. They would merely set up further bureaucracies.

This bill if enacted into law would establish a National Advisory Commission on Education of nine members. We are told that they would be lay persons. They would from time to time recommend to the Secretary the initiation of studies of national concern in the field of education. They would have authority to appoint consultants. They would receive \$50 per day and travel expenses while traveling to and from committee meetings. And finally the bill authorizes the appropriation of whatever funds are necessary to carry out the act, including the expenses of professional, clerical, and stenographic assistants. In other words, the legislation would set up a new bureau within the bureau which, if it followed the pattern of other bureaus, would grow and expand indefinitely. While the expense to the Government in the beginning might not amount to over a few hundred thousand dollars per year, there is every reason to believe that it would expand into a full-size operation. Our experience with and observation of these commissions justify the assertion that they go on and on ad infinitum. The Government is already topheavy with commissions and bureaus.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I wonder if the information which will be presented pursuant

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9040

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 13, 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

AN ACT

To authorize cooperative research in education.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That in order to enable the Office of Education more effec-
4 tively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties
5 for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of
6 Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly
7 financed cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges,
8 and State educational departments for the conduct of research,
9 surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.

10 SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
11 to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Educa-

1 tion, and Welfare, such sums, not to exceed \$400,000 in any
2 fiscal year, as the Congress determines to be necessary to
3 carry out the purposes of this Act.

Passed the House of Representatives May 12, 1954.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To authorize cooperative research in education.

MAY 13, 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor
and Public Welfare

AUTHORIZING COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN
EDUCATION

JUNE 14 (legislative day, JUNE 11), 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. PURTELL (for Mr. COOPER), from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 9040]

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That (a) in order to enable the Office of Education more effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with public and other non-profit universities and colleges and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.

(b) No contract or jointly financed cooperative arrangement shall be entered into under this section until the Commissioner of Education has obtained the advice and recommendations of educational research specialists who are competent to evaluate the proposals as to the soundness of their design, the possibilities of securing productive results, the adequacy of resources to conduct the proposed research, surveys, or demonstrations, and their relationship to other similar educational research already completed or in process.

(c) The Commissioner of Education shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the research, surveys, and demonstrations initiated under this Act, the recommendations made by research specialists pursuant to subsection (b), and any action taken with respect to such recommendations.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

In order to strengthen educational services and facilities, this bill authorizes the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to make arrangements with universities, colleges and

State educational agencies for joint studies of the problems of American education.

At the present time the Office of Education has no legislative authority to enter into contracts for jointly financed research projects with colleges, universities, and State educational agencies which are trying to solve educational problems. The prime advantage of cooperative research work with these organizations in the field of education is that such procedure makes full use of existing facilities and avoids the centralization of staff and facilities in Washington. The same procedure has been followed in the field of public health, for example, and has resulted in notable improvements and great returns for each Federal dollar spent.

METHOD OF OPERATION

In carrying out the provisions of this bill, the Office of Education will receive applications for Federal assistance from public and private nonprofit universities and colleges, and from State educational agencies, in order to carry on research work which would be valuable to school districts throughout the country. The applications will be carefully studied and selections made on the basis of importance and value of the projects to the largest number of educational groups that will benefit from the results. After the "allotment" or "grant" is made, the Office of Education will not exercise any control or direction over the university, college, or State educational agency other than the normal procedures followed in insuring that the terms of a contract are properly carried out. The results of the project will be made available to educational agencies throughout the country. Utilization of the findings will, of course, be made by school systems on a purely voluntary basis.

This method of carrying on research in the field of education will stimulate studies of the most pressing problems, provide benefits for a larger number of schools and make each dollar spent by the Federal Government go further.

EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH STUDIES

There are many areas in the field of education in which cooperative research holds out great promise for increased economy and efficiency. Some examples of studies which might be undertaken under this cooperative research program are as follows:

- (a) Reducing the cost of educational facilities.
- (b) Improving business procedures in schools and colleges.
- (c) Reorganizing school districts for maximum efficiency.
- (d) Attracting more young people into teaching, engineering, and other "shortage" professions.
- (e) Improving teaching methods.
- (f) Developing closer ties with parents and citizens.
- (g) Placing community health and social agencies in proper perspective with school programs.

CHANGES MADE BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amendment would effect several changes in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. It would divide section 1 into three subsections with the subject matter of section 1 of the House-passed bill being included in subsection (a) of section 1 of the bill as reported.

In subsection (a), the committee amendment would restrict the universities and colleges with which the contracts or arrangements could be made to public and other nonprofit institutions. The House-passed bill was not so limited.

The bill provides, of course, that contracts or arrangements may be entered into with State educational agencies. In this regard it is not intended by the committee to restrict the projects conducted under the provisions of this bill solely to the State educational agency. The committee recognizes that certain projects may quite properly fall within the jurisdiction of local educational agencies. Such projects are permissible under the provisions of the bill but the Commissioner of Education is required to make the contract or arrangement with the State educational agency rather than being permitted to bypass the State agency and deal directly with local school agencies.

Subsection (b) of section 1 did not appear in the House bill. It would prohibit the making of any contract or arrangement under subsection (a) until the Commissioner of Education had obtained the advice and recommendations of educational research specialists competent to evaluate the proposals as to the soundness of their design, the possibilities of productive results, the adequacy of the resources to conduct the project, and its relationship to other similar work completed or in process.

Subsection (c) of section 1 is also new. It would require the Commissioner to report to Congress annually on the research and other work initiated under the bill, the recommendations of the specialists under subsection (b), and any action taken with respect thereto.

The committee believes these two related additions will aid in effectuating the purpose of supporting worthwhile educational research, surveys, and demonstrations and in assuring the most efficient and effective use of the Federal funds appropriated for this purpose. The advice of groups of specialists and experts has proved valuable in other fields, notably public-health research and similar projects, and it should prove equally valuable here.

The bill passed by the House limited the appropriations authorized to \$400,000 per year. The committee removed this limitation, since the matter of the amount of the funds can be worked out best each year between the Department and the Congress. The Department has indicated it plans to request \$100,000 for the first year.

Calendar No. 1609

83D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 9040

[Report No. 1596]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 13, 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

JUNE 14 (legislative day, JUNE 11), 1954

Reported by Mr. PURTELL (for Mr. COOPER), with an amendment

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

To authorize cooperative research in education.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That in order to enable the Office of Education more effec-
4 tively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties
5 for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of
6 Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly
7 financed cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges,
8 and State educational departments for the conduct of re-
9 search, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.

10 SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
11 to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Educa-

1 tions, and Welfare, such sums, not to exceed \$400,000 in any
2 fiscal year, as the Congress determines to be necessary to
3 carry out the purposes of this Act.

4 That (a) in order to enable the Office of Education more
5 effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the
6 duties for which it was originally established, the Commis-
7 sioner of Education is authorized to enter into contracts or
8 jointly financed cooperative arrangements with public and
9 other nonprofit universities and colleges and State educa-
10 tional agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and
11 demonstrations in the field of education.

12 (b) No contract or jointly financed cooperative arrange-
13 ment shall be entered into under this section until the Com-
14 missioner of Education has obtained the advice and recom-
15 mendations of educational research specialists who are com-
16 petent to evaluate the proposals as to the soundness of their
17 design, the possibilities of securing productive results, the
18 adequacy of resources to conduct the proposed research, sur-
19 veys, or demonstrations, and their relationship to other simi-
20 lar educational research already completed or in process.

21 (c) The Commissioner of Education shall transmit to the
22 Congress annually a report concerning the research, surveys,
23 and demonstrations initiated under this Act, the recommenda-
24 tions made by research specialists pursuant to subsection (b),
25 and any action taken with respect to such recommendations.

1 *SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated*
2 *annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health,*
3 *Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress de-*
4 *termines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this*
5 *Act.*

Passed the House of Representatives May 12, 1954.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk.

83^d CONGRESS
2^d SESSION

H. R. 9040

[Report No. 1596]

AN ACT

To authorize cooperative research in education.

MAY 13, 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor
and Public Welfare

JUNE 14 (legislative day, JUNE 11), 1954

Reported with an amendment

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 18, 1954
For actions of June 17, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 112

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....5	Foreign aid.....28	Personnel.....15,17
Appropriations.....6,7	Forestry.....19	Prices, support.....23
Banking and currency....25	Furniture.....3	Section 32 funds.....1
Budgeting.....24	Housing, farm.....2	Statistics.....27
Economic policies.....12	Imports.....4	Stockpiling.....29
Education.....9,16	Lands, public.....26	Surplus commodities..11,22
Electrification.....14	reclamation.....10	Vehicles.....3
Farm organizations.....20	Legislative program...5,13	Water resources.....21
Farm program.....8	Loans, farm.....2	Wildlife.....18
Fishery products.....1		

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to earmark Sec. 32 funds for fishery products. House voted to send housing bill to conference. House passed bill to authorize GSA motor-vehicle pools and furniture control. Senate committee worked on farm program bill. Senate completed congressional action on independent offices appropriation bill. Rep. Cannon criticized flexible price supports.

HOUSE

1. FISHERY PRODUCTS. Passed without amendment S. 2302, which earmarks part of the Sec. 32 funds for education, publicity, and research in connection with fishery products until June 30, 1957, but limits the amount of expenditures for the purposes of the bill to \$3,000,000 annually, and limits the amount which may be used to purchase fish and other seafoods to \$1,500,000 (pp. 8029-31). This bill will now be sent to the President.
2. HOUSING LOANS. Agreed, 360-19, to a resolution to send to conference H. R. 7839, the omnibus housing bill which includes a provision to continue the farm housing program administered by this Department (pp. 8308-24). Senate conferees have been appointed.
3. VEHICLES; FURNITURE. Passed with amendments (essentially as reported) H. R. 8753, to authorize GSA to establish and operate motor vehicle pools and systems and to provide office furniture and furnishings when agencies are moved to new locations, to direct the GSA to report the unauthorized use of Government motor vehicles, and to authorize CSC to regulate operators of Government motor vehicles (pp. 8024-9).
4. IMPORTS. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9315, to extend on a reciprocal basis the period of free entry of Philippine articles into the U. S. (H. Rept. 1837)(pp. 8007, 8039).
5. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 21 (p. 8039). Legislative program for next week, as

announced by Rep. Halleck; Mon., Consent Calendar, Virgin Islands organic act; Tues., Private Calendar; followed by miscellaneous bills including the foreign-aid and farm-program bills if reported in time (p. 8031).

SENATE

6. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 8583, and acted on amendments which had been reported in disagreement (pp. 7971-2). This bill will now be sent to the President.
7. DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 8373 (pp. 7969-88, 7991-3, 7996-8). Senate conferees were appointed (p. 7998).
8. FARM PROGRAM. In considering S. 3052, the overall farm program bill, the Agriculture and Forestry Committee announced that it "had tentatively agreed to — (1) authorize the CCC to pay processing and transportation costs of surplus food commodities distributed within the U. S., and to portside for those being distributed abroad; (2) retain present law whereby penal and corrective institutions are not eligible to receive surplus food commodities without cost; and (3) a provision that beginning in 1956 the parity price for basic commodities cannot be reduced more than 5 percent per year during transition from old parity formula to the new parity formula."
9. EDUCATION. Passed as reported H. R. 7434, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education, and H. R. 9040, to authorize cooperative research in education (pp. 8005-6).
10. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. J. Res. 165, to authorize the Glendo unit, Wyo., Missouri Basin project (S. Rept. 1615) (p. 7951).
11. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. S. 2475, the surplus-disposal bill, was ordered printed to show House amendments (p. 7959).
12. ECONOMIC POLICIES. Sen. Carlson commended the Administration's economic policies, including pricing, budgeting, taxation, and foreign trade, and Sen. Bush inserted a New York Times article on this subject (pp. 7960-1).
13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Knowland announced that today the Senate is to consider H. R. 6435, to extend the Commodity Exchange Act to onions (which was made the unfinished business), and S. 3487, to authorize banks of cooperatives to issue consolidated debentures. He indicated that the trade agreements bill would be brought up Mon. and that there might also be a calendar call. (pp. 7998, 8006.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

14. ELECTRIFICATION. S. 3623 and 3624, by Sen. Anderson (for himself and others), to provide for power generation at Cougar and Green Peter Dams; to Public Works Committee (p. 7952). Remarks of author (pp. 7952-7).
15. PERSONNEL. S. 3627, by Sen. Carlson, to correct a "loophole" in the Civil Service Retirement Act; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 7952). Remarks of author (pp. 7957-8).
16. EDUCATION. S. 3628 and 3629, by Sen. Upton (for himself and others), to amend and make permanent the program of school assistance in Federally affected

An advisory committee on education in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should be established by law. This recommendation carries forward an objective of the reorganization plan under which the Department was created last year. This committee, composed of lay citizens, would identify educational problems of national concern to be studied by the Office of Education or by experts outside the Government, and would advise on action needed in the light of these studies.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

The third bill, H. R. 9040, to establish a cooperative research program, represents an extremely useful complement to the two proposals mentioned. It would carry out the President's budget message recommendation "that legislation be enacted which will enable the Office of Education to join its resources with those of State and local agencies, universities, and other education organizations for the conduct of cooperative research, surveys, and demonstration projects."

The purpose of this research program is to strengthen educational research and facilities by authorizing cooperative research arrangements between the Federal Government and colleges, universities, and State educational agencies concerned with the problems of American education. At the present time the Office of Education is not specifically authorized to enter into projects involving the joint expenditure of funds for these purposes.

Cooperative research arrangements of the sort proposed in H. R. 9040 have shown great returns—notably in the field of public health—for each Federal dollar spent. We are convinced that such arrangements can make equally valuable contributions in the field of education where the need for research is great.

One important advantage of the approach proposed in H. R. 9040 is that, while increasing and improving the research services available, the bill would not add substantially to the research staff of the Office of Education.

To summarize, by way of conclusion:

The State and White House Conferences on Education would foster nationwide understanding of the problems of education and mobilize resources for local, State, and Federal action.

The National Advisory Committee would make available the advice and recommendations of outstanding citizens.

Cooperative research in education would stimulate solutions to educational problems of national significance.

Together, the three bills guarantee, I believe, a wise, constructive, and well-balanced approach to the educational problems of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment on page 1, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 1, in line 12, after the word "education", to strike out "before November 30, 1955"; on page 2, after line 1, to strike out:

SEC. 2. (a) Each State shall be requested to bring together, prior to the White House Conference on Education, educators and interested citizens to discuss educational problems in the State and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken at local, State, and Federal levels.

(b) Each State shall be requested to make a report of the findings and recommendations of the State conference for use of the White House Conference on Education.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 2. (a) To assist each State to bring together, prior to the White House Conference on Education, educators and lay citizens to discuss educational problems in the State and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken at local, State, and Federal levels, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,500,000. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be allotted to the States on the basis of their respective populations according to the latest figures certified by the Department of Commerce, except that no State's allotment shall be less than \$15,000 and not more than \$75,000.

(b) The Commissioner of Education shall pay, through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, its allotment to each State which, through its Governor or other State official designated by the Governor, undertakes to accept and use the sums so paid exclusively for the purpose set forth in subsection (a), and to make a report of the findings and recommendations of the State conference for use of the White House Conference on Education. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until December 31, 1955, and any such sums remaining unpaid to the States or unobligated by them as of that date shall be returned to the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 3. There are also authorized to be appropriated to the Commissioner of Education for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954, June 30, 1955, and June 30, 1956, such sums as Congress determines to be necessary for the administration of this act and for other expenses of the Office of Education in planning for and holding the White House Conference on Education and in making available to the public the findings and recommendations of the conference. The Commissioner of Education is also authorized to accept, use, and dispose of funds, equipment, and facilities donated for purposes of the conference, and, to the extent consistent with such purposes, to use the same in accordance with the wishes of the donors.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 3. There are also authorized to be appropriated to the Commissioner of Education for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1955, and June 30, 1956, such sums as Congress determines to be necessary for the administration of this act, including the expenses of the Office of Education in making available to the public the findings and recommendations of the conference. The Commissioner of Education is also authorized to accept funds, equipment, and facilities donated for purposes of the conference and to use the same in accordance with such purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7434.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7434) to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to say a word of appreciation for the very fine and conscientious work of the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] as a member of the subcommittee on education. His experience, good judgment, and conscientious interest have been of tremendous help to the committee.

I have also noted that, as a new member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the work and judgment of the junior Senator from New Hampshire in the consideration of labor and health legislation has been of great value to the whole committee.

H. R. 7434 would establish a 9-member, representative committee, with 3-year overlapping terms, which would advise the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on pressing problems in the field of education. The Commissioner of Education would serve ex officio as a nonvoting member of the committee.

The establishment of this committee was urged by President Eisenhower in his budget message of January 21, 1954.

As I said a few minutes ago, the committee would study and advise the Secretary on national educational problems. Among other things, it could recommend to the Secretary the initiation of forces to study problems of national concern, and could recommend appropriate action indicated by such studies.

Funds will be appropriated to the extent determined by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were, on page 1, line 5, after the word "representative", to strike out "citizens" and insert "lay and professional persons"; on page 2, at the beginning of line 5, to insert "a majority of whom shall be lay persons"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "The Committee shall report annually to the House and the Senate Committees on Education and labor."; after line 6, to strike out:

SEC. 5. Members of the Committee, while travelling to or from or attending meetings of the Committee, shall be paid travel expenses.

And insert:

The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the studies initiated under this act, the recommendations made by the Committee, and any action taken with respect to such recommendations.

SEC. 5. Members of the Committee, while traveling to or from or attending meetings of the Committee, shall receive compensa-

tion at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$50 per diem, and shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act, including expenses of professional, clerical, and stenographic assistance, and such appropriations shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9040.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) in order to enable the Office of Education more effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to enter into contract or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with public and other non-profit universities and colleges and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.

(b) No contract or jointly financed cooperative arrangement shall be entered into

under this section until the Commissioner of Education has obtained the advice and recommendations of educational research specialists who are competent to evaluate the proposals as to the soundness of their design, the possibilities of securing productive results, the adequacy of resources to conduct the proposed research, surveys, or demonstrations, and their relationship to other similar educational research already completed or in process.

(c) The Commissioner of Education shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the research, surveys, and demonstrations initiated under this act, the recommendations made by research specialists pursuant to subsection (b), and any action taken with respect to such recommendations.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, House bill 9040 is designed to strengthen educational research services and facilities by offering cooperative research arrangements between the Federal Government and various public and non-profit colleges and universities and State educational agencies concerned with the problems of American education.

At the present time, the Office of Education has no legislative authorization to enter into contracts for jointly financed research projects with colleges, universities, State departments of education, which are trying to solve educational problems.

Joint efforts with such groups are of basic importance. They can make valuable contributions in the field of education.

Mr. President, this is the last of a series of three bills. Again I should like to say that while the bills, in their extent, are rather modest measures, yet they do represent the beginning of a

program by this administration to strengthen education. I have already stated, it is the first comprehensive program proposed by any administration.

I also wish to say that the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Secretary Hobby, and Commissioner Samuel Brownell, gave the committee excellent assistance. They are developing an educational program that will be of great benefit in the field of education in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9040) was read the third time, and passed.

INCLUSION OF ONIONS UNDER THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1510, House bill 6435, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6435) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment.

RECESS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 18, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 23, 1954
For actions of June 22, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 115

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriation.....1	Imports.....8,14	Roads.....37
Appropriations...3,13,19,28	Land, public.....26	Soil conservation.....17
Banking & currency...12,23	reclamation.....7,22	Stockpiling.....13
Building & grounds.....10	transfers.....6,35	Strategic materials.....13
Dairy industry.....39	Legislative program.....28	Surplus commodities....2,41
Disbursing.....5	Loans, farm.....15	Taxation.....18,28
Education.....9,24,32	Minerals.....26,33	Tobacco.....8
Electrification.....27,36	Organization.....34	Trade agreements.....20
Extension Service.....28	Payrolling.....5	Trade, foreign...8,11,28,31
Farm program.....16,40,44	Personnel.....5,21	TVA.....38
Flood control.....3	Prices.....29	Virgin Islands.....14
Forests & forestry.....4	Price supports.....41	Water conservation....28,30
Health.....25	REA.....27	Water resources.....43
	Research.....42	Weather control.....42

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on agricultural appropriation bill. Senate passed watershed bill. House passed forest-land use bill. Surplus commodities bill was sent to conference. Senate debated trade agreements bill. Senate committees reported tax revision bill and Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Both Houses agreed to conference report on Army flood-control appropriation bill, but Sen. Long entered motion to reconsider. Rep. Neal criticized surplus commodities bill and high price supports. Senate committee made decisions on farm program bill. Senate committee voted to report Federal employees' life insurance bill.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 8779 (pp. 8187-9). Attached to this Digest are statements pertaining to the measure.
2. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Reps. Hope, Andresen, Hill, Cooley, and Poage, and Sens. Aiken, Young, Thyne, Hickenlooper, Schoeppel, Ellender, Johnston, Holland, and Anderson were appointed conferees on S. 2475, to aid in disposal of surplus agricultural commodities (pp. 8142-4, 8233-4).
3. FLOOD-CONTROL APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 8367, the Army civil functions appropriation bill for 1955, which includes flood-control items; but Sen. Long entered a motion to reconsider the Senate vote (pp. 8155-8, 8209-10).
4. FORESTRY. Passed as reported H. R. 2762, to revise the authority of the Department to issue permits for construction on and use of areas within the national forests for various purposes connected with commercial and industrial development, public use by State and other governmental agencies, and for educational

and recreational purposes (p. 8193).

The Government Operations Committee submitted reports on "The Government in Business -- Commissaries -- Forest Service -- Part 3" (H. Rept. 1908) and "The Government in Business -- Sawmills -- Part 4" (H. Rept. 1939)(p. 8241).

5. DISBURSING; PAYROLLING. Agreed to the conference report on S. 2844, to make permanent the authority for U. S. disbursing officers to perform certain financial transactions, such as payments in foreign currencies in connection with foreign duty (p. 8208).

Passed with amendment S. 2728, to authorize collection of indebtedness of Government personnel resulting from erroneous payments (pp. 8208-9).

6. LAND TRANSFERS. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. J. Res. 458, to direct USDA to quitclaim retained rights in a tract of former FHA land to the Board of Education of Irwin County, Ga. (p. 8189). This measure will now be sent to the President.

Passed as reported H. R. 4928, to authorize sale of a tract of land at the U. S. Animal Quarantine Station to Clifton, N. J. (p. 8193).

7. RECLAMATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 8027, to extend for 3 years the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws (p. 8198).

8. PHILIPPINE IMPORTS. Discussed and, at the request of Rep. Bonner, passed over H. R. 9315, to provide for an extension on a reciprocal basis of the period of free entry of Philippine articles into the U. S. Rep. Bonner objected to the bill because the Philippine Government has rejected a bill to remove the restrictions on importation of Virginia leaf tobacco into the Philippines. (pp. 8206-7.)

9. EDUCATION. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 9040, to authorize cooperative research in education, and H. R. 7434, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education (p. 8225). Senate conferees have been appointed.

10. BUILDINGS. The conferees agreed to file a report on H. R. 6342, to authorize purchase contracts for the erection of new Federal buildings (p. D721).

Rep. McCormack commended the service of William E. Reynolds, Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service (p. 8237).

11. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Williams, N. J., spoke in favor of expansion of foreign trade and the Randall Commission recommendations (pp. 8225-33).

12. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Rep. Patman criticized the current policies regarding Federal Reserve requirements, etc. (pp. 8237-9).

13. STOCKPILING APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President a supplemental appropriation estimate of \$380,000,000 for 1955 for stockpiling strategic and critical materials (H. Doc. 441)(p. 8240).

14. VIRGIN ISLANDS. Passed with amendments S. 3378, to revise the organic act of the Virgin Islands (pp. 8210-22). No change was made in the provision regarding importation of diseased animals.

15. FARM LOANS. Passed as reported H. R. 5997, to provide that the Hawaii Legislature may authorize the issuance of general obligation bonds for purchase and making of mortgages on homes and farms of veterans (p. 8197).

peace may rest on the decisions that are made at this conference—perhaps without the benefit of congressional participation and approval. Pray God, it may be peace—for if it is war it will mean the end of Christian civilization as we now know it. God forbid that such a calamity should ever come to pass.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. WITHROW. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for a very remarkable statement. I sincerely hope that the President of the United States will take heed in this particular instance.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's enlightening statement. I have watched the gentleman's votes during the years I have been a Member of this House, and I have noted that the gentleman does not talk one way and vote another. I want to compliment the gentleman on this splendid address which he has just given us.

I have for many years felt as the gentleman has expressed in his statement here today, that we cannot buy friends, that we cannot buy security, that our hope for peace and security depends on our maintaining our own military strength and being strong enough to repel any attack that may be made against us. I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine talk which he has just made.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7601) to provide for a White House Conference on Education, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McCONNELL, GWINN, and BARDEN.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and

agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McCONNELL, GWINN, and BARDEN.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7434) to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McCONNELL, GWINN, and BARDEN.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

(Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a junior Member in this House approaches the responsibility of speaking here with considerable caution, and I must say, following the eloquence of the esteemed gentleman from Illinois, with some trepidation.

Are we living in an age of nightmares? The stalemate in Korea, the setbacks in Indochina and the continuing advance of the Communist hordes in Asia, together with the tragi-comic opera diversion we have seen in the Senate committee here at home, all combine to make us wonder whether we really are seeing these things happen or whether it is only bad dream.

Would that it were only a dream. Would that it were not true that the nations of the free world did not appear to be incapable of acting together to stem this advance. Would that the United States were not so obsessed by the fear of internal subversion and so susceptible to those who unpatriotically manufacture political capital out of such fears that this country seems incapable of pursuing its own interests abroad.

We resemble the giant in Gulliver's Travels. We are potentially strong, but we are allowing ourselves to be tied by the strands of pygmies. We must break those strands, and act in our own self-interest.

These are problems that will not solve themselves. We cannot merely sit back

and hope that world conditions will improve. Strong statements endorsing obvious generalities will not accomplish any useful objective. The United States will be judged by its deeds, not by its statements of good intentions.

This is not to say that the United States should throw its weight around militarily. That we must be prepared, militarily, is obvious. But military preparedness is not enough. The countries of the free world must act as a cohesive unit if they are to preserve their liberties against Communist encroachments. Basic to effective political action is economic cooperation. It is in this area that the United States has its greatest obligation and the greatest of all opportunities. But it is in this area that the United States is the most timid, the most blind, and apparently least able to act effectively.

Just last week, we again procrastinated and put off a vitally necessary decision on our long-range trade policy—presumably put it off for another year. The most damaging aspect of this lack of responsibility on the part of this Congress is the fact that trade patterns in international trade are gelling and since no one can look to the United States with any degree of certainty, we are suffering for our own lack of courage.

THE UNITED STATES IS A BIG COUNTRY

The United States is such a big country that we often fail to appreciate the repercussions of our own actions. A mere ripple of economic recession in the United States can become a veritable tidal wave abroad. Among the most vivid fears of some of our European friends is the fear that the United States economy will enter a slump. A given amount of international trade which is almost infinitesimal to the United States can mean the difference between prosperity and depression in a friendly foreign country.

Compare, for instance, Italy and the United States. The gross national product of the United States is over ten times as great as that of Italy. A given amount of trade, therefore, between the two countries is more than ten times as important, in terms of aggregates, to Italy as to the United States. On a per capita basis the average Italian is less than one-third as well off as the average American.

Even the United Kingdom, which we think of as being closer to the United States in terms of wealth than Italy, the gross national product in 1950 was equivalent to about one-fifth that of the United States and, on a per capita basis, was a little better than 63 percent as large as that of the United States.

In France the gross national product was about 15 percent as large as that of the United States. On a per capita basis it was 53 percent.

Comparison of gross national products and foreign trade of France, Italy, United Kingdom, and the United States, 1951

[In millions]

Country	Gross national product	Per capita national product	Total imports	Total exports	Total exports and imports	Ratio of exports and imports to gross national product
						Percent
France.....	34,000	810	4,551	4,175	8,726	26
Italy.....	16,000	347	2,167	1,647	3,814	24
United Kingdom.....	46,000	901	10,575	7,223	17,798	39
United States.....	330,000	2,185	10,921	14,888	25,809	8

Source: United Nations, Economic Survey of Europe Since the War, Geneva, 1953, and Yearbook of International Trade Statistics, 1952, New York, 1953.

Because of this great discrepancy in size there are many products which are important exports to other nations of the free world which represent but a drop in the bucket to the vast American market. There are many goods, the imports of which the United States could stimulate without damaging the American market. I shall discuss some possibilities along this line in a few moments.

THE TARIFF ISSUE, 1954 STYLE

The quarrel between free traders and protectionists has been a classic in American history. It is so much a part of the American political scene that even today we cannot help thinking of the issue in the traditional but outmoded terms.

Extreme protectionists and extreme free traders probably will go on debating the tariff versus free trade issue for many years to come. Each will continue to think of himself as the guardian of American prosperity and freedom. Such controversy will do no harm, and it might do some good ultimately, provided that we do not stop short of decision as the problems actually confront us. Free trade versus protection is a doctrinal issue, whereas the problem of international trade at this crucial juncture of American history is not a doctrinal dispute. It is a situation that confronts us. The problem is a real one and its solution is vital to our survival as a free nation.

Foreign trade policy is a powerful weapon with which we can counter the trade moves that the Russians have launched as a part of their peace offensive in the cold war. We have delayed too long on a decision. Let us face our responsibilities and make one.

THE RUSSIAN TRADE OFFENSIVE

Russia does not like the embargoes that the free nations of the West have imposed upon shipments of strategic goods. They are exerting whatever pressures they can to induce the West to relax them. Liberal-sounding invitations to trade with them have been forthcoming and they are a great temptation to other countries of the free world. Only last January they offered to buy more than \$1 billion worth of goods from Britain alone if only trade were to be opened up.

Ostensibly, at least, the new policy of Russia, following the death of Stalin, is aimed not only at rapid industrialization but also at improving the low standard of living of the Russian people. Evidence of slight recession in the United States

is a powerful weapon in the hands of the Russians in this endeavor.

For the past year American newspapers and news periodicals have been filled with articles telling about Russia's western trade offensive. The New York Times has reported that the flow of goods from western to Communist countries through the Free Port of Antwerp has more than doubled since the death of Stalin. Only about a month ago the Amtorg Trading Corp. came to life again, after having been dormant for nearly 5 years. The countries of the Middle East are probing deep behind the Iron Curtain for new markets, and the French and the Russians only recently concluded a trade pact providing for French shipments of rayon and woolen goods in exchange for coal, corn, manganese, and asbestos.

On January 21 Belgium-Luxembourg and the Soviet Union signed a trade agreement under which Moscow undertakes to send cereals, oil cake, forestry products, cellulose, small automobiles, ferromanganese, chrome, gasoline and oil, and asbestos.

In the trade agreement with the Netherlands, signed last April 29, the Dutch agreed to build and send freighters, refrigerators, ships, barges, and floating derricks to the Soviet, as well as to send them textiles, raw materials, butter, meat, and herring. In exchange, the Soviet agreed to export to the Dutch grains, wood, cellulose, anthracite coal, coal-tar products, asbestos, automobiles, and furs.

Just a few weeks ago it was reported that the Soviet Union was bidding Latin Americans to talk trade with them. On May 1 they were invited by the Soviet Union to send representatives to Moscow next September for talks aimed at expansion of trade.

As of January of this year the Soviet Union had trade agreements in force with: Argentina, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Great Britain, Greece, Iceland, India, Iran, Italy, Norway, Sweden, and West Germany. At the same time Communist China had agreements with: Ceylon, Chile, Finland, France, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Switzerland, and West Germany.

As Joseph Harsch, of the Christian Science Monitor, observed last December, "the overall fact appears to be that, whether Washington likes it or not, most of the free world is interested in increasing its trade with the Soviet bloc coun-

tries and is, in fact, in the process of doing so."

[From the Washington Star of February 6, 1954]

RUSSIA BIDS FOR TRADE

The Soviet Union is dangling a tempting lure before non-Communist nations in its proposals for sharply increased trade across the Iron Curtain. While the most spectacular of these—an "offer" of more than \$1 billion in contracts with British industry over a 3-year period—is still far from actual trade, several other agreements are at a considerably more advanced stage. Among these are deals with Finland, Argentina, Norway, and Sweden.

It is understood, of course, by those who are parties to these agreements that there are many difficult steps between understandings with the Soviet Foreign Trade Ministry and the actual transactions in money and goods. Private enterprise, not government, controls commerce in the non-Communist countries and it is interested in buying or selling only at profitable prices and not for political purposes. The Reds, while clearly engaged in a trade offensive that they hope may tend to split the United States from its Western allies, are still hard bargainers and difficult customers to satisfy. Furthermore, most of the Western nations being wooed by the Communists are still abiding by the restrictions against shipment of strategic goods behind the Iron Curtain. A spokesman for the British Board of Trade already has commented in connection with the current offer that increased trade would be welcome "provided it is within the non-strategic field." British authorities are on record as pledging there will be no unilateral relaxation by them of the export controls on strategic goods.

There are, however, some fundamental factors constantly working on the side of expanding East-West trade. Quite apart from what Soviet Russia or its satellite countries may want or need from the West, there are reverse attractions that cannot be wiped out by simple political edict. Britain, for example, depends upon the Soviet Union for approximately a fifth of its timber imports and about a third of its grain imports. Other West European nations buy these same commodities from behind the Iron Curtain and some depend heavily upon Russian coal. Chrome, tungsten, and manganese are purchasable from Russia. In order to buy, the western nations must also sell—and the East offers at least a limited market for many of the goods, even in the non-strategic category, which the West produces and cannot sell as readily elsewhere.

At the same time, there is danger in the illusion that trade with the Soviet bloc can be relied upon as a dependable contributor to the western economy. As the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce recently said:

"The Soviets and their satellites can offer outlets for certain (western) industries * * * However, it would be foolish and indeed suicidal to depend for the prosperity of such industries on the good will of totalitarian governments which can just as easily turn off trade as they can turn it on."

It is, then, a problem that might best be handled on a deal-by-deal basis in which the objective is a net gain for the West. This, in fact, is substantially the point of view of our own Government as well as that of some of our allies. Secretary of State Dulles told the House Foreign Affairs Committee last year that the administration is not urging curtailment of East-West trade in Europe (despite pressures to do so) because "we believe that trade, under certain conditions, can be carried on more to our advantage than to our disadvantage."

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 24, 1954
For actions of June 23, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 116

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriations.....1	Foreign aid.....2,17	Newsprint.....23
Appropriations.....6,15	Forests & forestry.....23	Personnel.....18
Dairy industry.....11	Housing, loans.....3	Prices, support.....13,21
Disbursing.....10	Imports.....8,14	Surplus commodities.....26
Education.....9	Labor, farm.....7	Textiles.....22
Family-size farms.....13	Lands, reclamation.....16	Tobacco.....14,27
Farm program.....4,12,20	transfer.....19	Trade agreements.....5
Flood control.....6	Loans, farm.....3	TVA.....24
	Minerals.....8	Virgin Islands.....25

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on agricultural appropriation bill, and House concurred in amendments in disagreement. House and Senate committees made decisions on farm program bill. Both Houses received President's message favoring foreign aid program. Senate passed measure continuing farm housing program 1 month. Senate rejected motion to reconsider Army flood-control appropriations. Senate debated trade agreements bill. Senate passed bill to permit immigration of additional shepherders. Senate passed bill to continue duty-free copper imports. Rep. Patman spoke favoring family-size farm limit on price supports. House committee decided amounts in foreign aid bill. Rep. Sullivan urged distribution of surplus commodities to needy Americans.

SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 8779, and the House concurred in the two Senate amendments which had been reported in disagreement (pp. 8253, 8305-7). This bill will now be sent to the President.
2. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses received the President's message recommending amendment and continuation of the mutual security program; to Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee (H. Doc. 449)(pp. 8244, 8299-300). The President requested authorization of approximately \$3,500,000,000, of which \$2,748.4 million would be for military aid, \$241.3 million for Korea, \$256.4 million for development assistance, and \$131.6 million for technical cooperation. The Rules and Administration Committee reported with amendments S. Res. 214, providing for a study of technical-assistance programs by the Foreign Relations Committee (S. Rept. 1628)(p. 8245).
3. HOUSING LOANS. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 167, to continue various housing laws for July 1954 pending enactment of the regular housing bill (pp. 8250-1). This measure authorizes \$8,500,000 additional for loans under the farm housing program administered by this Department, plus additional amounts for contributions under the program.

4. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, during consideration of S. 3052, the farm program bill, "announced further tentative agreements which would-- (1) Authorize Secretary of Agriculture to limit use on acreage diverted from price-supported crops as a condition of eligibility for price support on any commodity; (2) repeal marketing quota authority for corn; (3) clarify the Secretary's authority to increase acreage allotments under certain conditions; and (4) make permanent a provision carried in recent appropriation acts for allocation of conservation payment funds on a basis of need, and direct the Secretary to give special consideration to diverted acreage problems" (p. D724).
5. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Continued debate on H. R. 9474, to continue the reciprocal trade agreements program for 1 additional year (pp. 8254-75, 8285, 8291, 8297).
6. FLOOD-CONTROL APPROPRIATIONS. Rejected a motion by Sen. Morse to reconsider the vote on the conference report regarding H. R. 8367, the Army civil functions appropriation bill for 1955 (pp. 8279-84). This bill will now be sent to the President.
7. FARM LABOR. Passed as reported S. 2862, to make special non-quota immigrant visas available to certain skilled alien sheepherders (pp. 8288, 8291-7).
8. COPPER IMPORTS. Passed as reported H. R. 7709, to continue duty-free imports of copper for 1 more year (pp. 8285-8). As passed by the House, the provision would be extended for 2 more years.
9. EDUCATION. Senate conferees were appointed on ~~H. R. 7434, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education~~, and H. R. 9040, to authorize cooperative research in education (pp. 8253-4). House conferees have been appointed.
10. DISBURSING. Agreed to the conference report on S. 2844, to make permanent the authority of U. S. disbursing officers to perform certain banking services for employees stationed abroad, etc. (p. 8275). This bill will now be sent to the President.
11. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Sen. Wiley inserted his statement favoring more consumption of dairy products and a Wisconsin Dairying article giving data on this matter (p. 8249).

HOUSE

12. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states: "Committee on Agriculture: Continued executive consideration of the general farm program, and adopted an amendment proposed by Representative Abernethy (Mississippi) which would make the 'normal supply' of cotton for any marketing year the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year for which such normal supply is being determined, plus the estimated exports of cotton for such marketing year, plus 20 percent of the sum of such consumption and exports as an allowance for carryover. Also adopted an amendment by Representative Lovre (South Dakota) which would place feed grains under the same support price established for corn. In the afternoon meeting the committee approved miscellaneous provisions relating to peanuts which will be incorporated in the general farm bill." (p. D726.)
13. FAMILY-SIZE FARMS; PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Patman spoke favoring family-size farms, inserted CCC tables showing comparison of figures on farm price-support loan, and stated that the present price supports encourage a movement toward big farms (pp. 8318-27).

made today will serve notice to all the nations and peoples of the Western Hemisphere of the dangers which confront us, and will serve to awaken free people everywhere.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his generous words. Coming from one of his stature and position, they gratify me very much.

The sentiments he has expressed will, I am certain, give notice to the nations of the Western Hemisphere of what we propose to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the editorial to which I referred a moment ago, which was published in *Diario Las Americas*, the *Americas Daily*, of Miami, Fla.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE OTHER GOVERNMENTS OF THE AMERICAS SHOULD HELP ANTI-COMMUNIST GUATEMALAN PATRIOTS

The moment has now arrived for the Guatemalan people to rise up in arms against a dictatorial Communist regime which has allied itself in treasonable fashion with the Soviet Union to the detriment of both national and hemispheric interests, causing the outbreak of a conflict featured by Guatemalan fighting against Guatemalan and provoking the greatest rift in hemispheric security that has occurred in the history of pan-Americanism.

Inasmuch as native Guatemalan Communists have an even greater responsibility toward their own country than do their confederates abroad, their action which has resulted in the shedding of Guatemalan blood will hang heavy in the balance of history. The foreign agents of international communism have been busy negotiating the fate of the Guatemalan people and their dignity as a nation, but the greatest share of the blame must be shouldered by the homegrown traitors to the Guatemalan nation who have compromised the peace and security of their fellow citizens.

Now that the battle cry of freedom has sounded in the midst of flying bullets—a situation that has arisen despite the fact that peaceful means would have been preferable for overthrowing the Communist dictatorship—the titanic struggle facing the anti-Communist people of Guatemala in their fight against the forces mustered by Russia's totalitarian ally has placed the governments of the Americas on a delicate spot. The dilemma confronting them will not admit of half-way measures. Either those governments must be definitely on the side of the freedom-loving people of Guatemala or they must be on the side of a government that is bound to follow the directions which the Kremlin dictates to it.

Because of the extreme gravity of the current situation, because of the fact that a handful of brave men have launched themselves on a war to liberate their people and preserve American solidarity, and because of the fact that a force of Guatemalans are laying down their lives to fight a Soviet spearhead aimed at the heart of the Americas, the governments of this hemisphere should hasten to lend their moral and their material support to those in the land of the Quetzal who are confronting an ally of Soviet imperialism. The patriots fighting today in Guatemala find themselves face to face with a government that recently received a \$10 million shipment of arms from behind the Iron Curtain.

To abandon the Guatemalans at this time during a battle with historic significance for them and for the entire Western Hemisphere

would be an act of injustice toward any people and it would be a gratuitous slap in the face to the fate of all the nations of the Americas. Just as happened in the case of Korea, when the immediate fate of the Americas was not directly involved, the Government of the United States should back up the anti-Communist forces of Guatemala, and it should be joined in this by its fellow American nations. Washington officials should not be alarmed that such action might be misinterpreted as an act of aggression against Guatemala; on the contrary, it could only be construed as intervention on the behalf of that nation. The current battle isn't directed against the Guatemalan people, but rather against a government that is being supported by the Kremlin. The nations of the Americas must not fail Guatemala in this historic moment.

The Communist-backed military might of the present Guatemalan Government must not be allowed to overwhelm the movement of liberation that has been initiated amidst bullets and sacrifices by a group of patriots inasmuch as hemispheric security would thereby be placed in jeopardy and the national dignity of Guatemala would be trampled underfoot.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for having yielded to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8779) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 20 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 129. An act to amend the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1049), authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

S. 932. An act to equalize the treatment accorded to commissioned officers of the Veterinary Corps with that accorded to commissioned officers of other corps of the Army Medical Service, and for other purposes;

S. 1665. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

S. 2212. An act for the relief of Alma S. Wittlin-Frischauer;

S. 2742. An act to amend the act of August 21, 1951, relating to certain payments out of Ute Indian tribal funds;

S. 2777. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

S. 2845. An act to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States;

S. 3103. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

S. 3364. An act to amend the act of October 31, 1949 (63 Stat. 1049); and

S. 3481. An act to amend sections 23A and 24A of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 23, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 129. An act to amend the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1049), authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

S. 932. An act to equalize the treatment accorded to commissioned officers of the Veterinary Corps with that accorded to commissioned officers of other corps of the Army Medical Service, and for other purposes;

S. 1665. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

S. 2212. An act for the relief of Alma S. Wittlin-Frischauer;

S. 2742. An act to amend the act of August 21, 1951, relating to certain payments out of Ute Indian tribal funds;

S. 2777. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

S. 2845. An act to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States;

S. 3103. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

S. 3364. An act to amend the act of October 31, 1949 (63 Stat. 1049); and

S. 3481. An act to amend sections 23A and 24A of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8779) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of Tuesday, June 22, 1954, p. 8187, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand that the conference report was unanimously approved by the conferees.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. The report was unanimously approved by the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the

Senate to the bill (H. R. 7434) to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7601) to provide for a White House Conference on Education, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9474) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me, for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the United States foreign-trade policy is one of the most important questions the Congress will consider this year. It is the cornerstone of our foreign policy. It is the weathervane that points to fair or foul weather in our domestic economy. The foreign-trade policy we adopt can mean the difference between prosperous export trade and falling prices and unmanageable surpluses. It can mean the difference between a high level of employment and unemployment for American workers. It can mean the difference between prosperity and depression for American business. It can mean the difference between allied economic solidarity and stagnation of trade and economic division in the free world.

The President of the United States, in his foreign economic policy statement of March 30, gave eloquent testimony to the need for adoption by the Congress of the amendment which I have offered. He said:

The United States stands ready and able to produce and sell more than the rest of the world can buy from us. The inability of many foreign countries to buy our goods in the volume we would like to sell does not arise from any lack of desire for these goods. Such is far from the case. Instead it arises out of the inability of these nations to pay—in dollars—for the volume we have to sell.

Dollar grants are no lasting solution to this impasse. * * * The solution is a higher level of two-way trade. Thus we can sell and receive payment for our exports and have an increasing volume of investment abroad to assist economic development overseas and yield return to us. Greater freedom from restrictions and controls and the increased efficiencies which arise from expanding markets and the freer play of economic forces are essential to the attainment of this higher trade level.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered on my own behalf, and on behalf of 24 other Senators, is designed to accomplish those objectives which President Eisenhower so forthrightly outlined.

As the President submitted his program on March 30, he called it the minimum which he considered essential. And with that characterization I thoroughly agree. I was sorely disappointed that the President did not go further in his recommendations for trade liberalization, but I think he was taking a step in the right direction, and I rise now to support that step in the right direction.

I think the program he outlined is the absolute minimum which must be enacted. I agree implicitly with his warning that "Failure to so move will directly threaten our domestic economy, for it will doom our efforts to find ways by which others, through their own efforts, can buy our goods."

Mr. President, to enact only a 1-year extension of the reciprocal trade agreements law means that once again we will do nothing to bolster our sagging world trade. It means that for another year the President will not have the minimum weapons he needs to meet and counter the growing threat of the Communist trade offensive. It means that our markets abroad will continue to contract and ultimately vanish. It means that for another year our customers abroad will wonder what our long-range trade policy will be, when finally we make up our minds. It means that the Soviet and Red Chinese trade bait will look more and more tempting to our allies as they grow more and more restive and uneasy, waiting for the United States to study the question further, and perhaps eventually make up its mind.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered upon behalf of myself and other Senators is in the nature of a substitute for the bill passed by the House of Representatives and reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee which provides merely for a 1-year extension of the existing law. The provisions of my amendment are substantially a verbatim version of H. R. 8860, introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative KEAN, of New Jersey. I am informed that members of the staff of the Randall Commission and officials of the executive department of the Government participated in the drafting of the bill. The amendment embodies the original recommendations of the administration.

In order that the Senate may be fully informed as to the scope of the amendment, I propose to take a few minutes of the Senate's time to explain its provisions.

Section 2 of the amendment provides for a 3-year extension of the basic authority of the President to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements. This 3-year extension will provide some assurance to our friends abroad with respect to the continuity of United States trade policy.

The basic authority for negotiation of trade agreements is contained in section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. Section 3 of my amendment makes certain modifications of existing law as recommended by the President.

Mr. President, I shall not repeat the detailed explanation of the bill, since it can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At this time I wish to analyze the conditions of world trade, and indicate the necessity of acting now to adopt a liberalized foreign trade policy.

Last year the administration and the Congress delayed taking definitive action on an international trade program. It was argued—with some justification, I think—that time was needed for the new administration to study and familiarize itself with the problems of world trade. So we marked time by enacting a simple 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This meant that we would do nothing. And we did nothing, not one new trade agreement was made.

During that year of inaction on our part, the Russian and Chinese Commu-

AUTHORIZING COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

JULY 19, 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. McCONNELL, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 9040]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *That (a) in order to enable the Office of Education more effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.*

(b) No contract or jointly financed cooperative arrangement shall be entered into under this section until the Commissioner of Education has obtained the advice and recommendations of educational research specialists who are competent to evaluate the proposals as to the soundness of their design, the possibilities of securing productive results, the adequacy of resources to conduct the proposed research, surveys, or demonstrations, and their relationship to other similar educational research already completed or in process.

(c) The Commissioner of Education shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the research, surveys, and demonstrations initiated under this Act, the recommendations made by research specialists pursuant to subsection (b), and any action taken with respect to such recommendations.

SEC. 2. *There are hereby authorized to the appropriated annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, Jr.,
RALPH GWINN,
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
ROBERT W. UPTON,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
LISTER HILL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted new provisions which differ from the House bill in some respects.

In the first section the Senate amendment provided that the Commissioner of Education could enter into contracts or arrangements with public and other nonprofit colleges and universities. The conference agreement omits the requirement that the college or university be a public or nonprofit one.

The Senate amendment also added to the House bill a requirement that the Commissioner of Education, before entering into any contract or arrangement under the act for research, surveys, or demonstrations in the field of education, must obtain the advice and recommendations of educational research specialists. It also requires that the Commissioner of Education report annually to the Congress with respect to operations under the act. The conference substitute retains these provisions.

The Senate amendment added a new section to the House bill which authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. The provision is retained in the substitute agreed upon in conference.

SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, Jr.,

RALPH GWINN,

AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 20, 1954
For actions of July 19, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 135

CONTENTS

Administrative procedure.....8	Farm program.....9	REA.....37
Animal disease.....18	Government competition..41	Research.....17,46
Appropriations	Health.....33,34	Roads.....12
.....14,15,33,34,54	Lands, public.....26	Social security.....2,33
Atomic energy.....5,36	reclamation	Soil conservation.....1
Beef purchases.....1110,24,33,35,47, 58	Strategic materials.....57
CCC.....16,21	Legislative program.....13	Surplus commodities..30,39
Claims.....14	Livestock.....44	Surplus property.....49
Containers.....55	Loans, farm.....5,20,22,43	Taxation.....44
Cooperatives.....20	Lobbying.....52	Trade, foreign.....56
Drought relief.....11,25	Minerals.....26	Transportation.....28
Education.....3,32	Performance ratings.....23	TVA.....6
Electrification.....36	Personnel.....23,33	Veterans' benefits....5,30
Export-Import Bank.....29	Pesticide chemicals.....33	Vocational rehabilitation
Extension service.....42	Plant patenting.....74,27,33
Fees.....49	Poultry.....39	Water conservation.....51
Flood control.....31,33,45	Price, support.....39	Water facilities loans..22
Foreign affairs.....40	Property.....48	Wheat quotas.....53
Forestry.....19,50		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on watershed bill. Senate committee voted to exclude farmers from social security bill. House received conference report on housing bill. House committee reported bill to increase CCC borrowing power, Rules Committee cleared bill. House committee reported water-facilities loans bill. House debated supplemental appropriation bill. House passed bill to authorize rotation of CCC stocks, sales of small lots, etc. House passed bill authorizing additional contract research.

SENATE

1. SOIL CONSERVATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6788, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation (pp. 10426-9).
2. SOCIAL SECURITY. The "Daily Digest" states that, during consideration of H. R. 9366, the social security bill, the Finance Committee "rescinded previous action relating to voluntary coverage of farm operators...and agreed to exclude the farm operators...as under existing law" and "with regard to agricultural workers, agreed to adopt, in lieu of House provisions, a test requiring \$50 in earnings from one employer" (p. D856).
3. EDUCATION. Agreed to the conference reports on H. R. 7434, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education, and H. R. 9040, to authorize cooperative research in education (pp. 10476-7).
4. VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION. Agreed to the conference report on S. 2759, to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation (pp. 10424-6).

5. FARM LOANS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment H. R. 8152, to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Veterans' Administration under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, and to make additional funds available therefor (S. Rept. 1911)(p. 10417).
6. ATOMIC ENERGY. Continued debate on S. 3690, to revise the Atomic Energy Act (pp. 10429-71, 10479-95). Most of the debate related to TVA.
7. PLANT PATENTING. The Judiciary Committee reported with/ out amendment H. R. 5420, providing that patents may be obtained on cultivated sports, mutants, hybrids, and newly found seedling plants (S. Rept. 1937)(p. 10478).
8. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE. The Judiciary Committee voted to report S. 17, to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies (p. D857).
9. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Aiken (for himself and Sens. Hickenlooper, Williams, Schoepel, Welker, Holland, and Anderson) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed jointly by them, to S. 3052, the farm program bill (p. 10419).
10. RECLAMATION. Sen. Bennett spoke in favor of the upper Colorado River project (p. 10420). Sen. Kuchel criticized the project (pp. 10471-6).
11. DROUGHT RELIEF. Sen. Symington urged additional drought relief, including beef purchases and a hay program (pp. 10420-1).
12. ROADS. Sen. Ferguson inserted a newspaper editorial favoring the President's new highway program (p. 10495).
13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Minority Leader Johnson said: "I do not believe we will meet the July 31 deadline" (p. 10497). Majority Leader Knowland said: "I hope ...we can complete as soon as possible after July 31 the legislative program..." (p. 10498).
14. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President supplemental appropriation estimates for payment of claims and judgments against the Government (H. Doc. 144)(p. 10416).

HOUSE

15. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Began and concluded general debate on this bill, H. R. 9936 (H. Rept. 2266)(pp. 10327-42). The bill is to be read for amendment today. For provisions of the bill, see Digest 134.
16. CCC STOCKS. Passed without amendment S. 1381, to authorize rotation of CCC stocks, sale of small lots of commodities, etc. (p. 10315). This bill will now be sent to the President.
17. RESEARCH. Passed without amendment S. 2367, to authorize this Department to enter into contracts for the conduct of research (p. 10315). (Such authority is already available for research performed under the Research and Marketing Act.) This bill will now be sent to the President.
18. ANIMAL DISEASE. Passed without amendment S. 2583, to indemnify against loss all persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1952 as a result of vesicular exanthema (applies only to Oregon)(p. 10315). This bill will now be sent to the President.

lower basin are to be taken only from "water present in the main stream and flowing at Lee Ferry," as Arizona contends, or from the tributaries as well, as California and Nevada contend; whether the 7,500,000 acre-feet referred to in article III (a) is related to the 75 million acre-feet referred to in article III (d), as Arizona contends, or whether the latter figure includes excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the compact, as California contends; by what process Arizona claims to have acquired an apportionment of 2,800,000 acre-feet of III (a) water, to be taken from the main stream; whether the apportionment of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum is a statement of a maximum, or of an average, and, if the latter, over what period of years; the definition and measurement of "beneficial consumptive use"; the accounting for water added to and withdrawn from storage on the main stream and tributaries; whether the use of water salvaged by man on the main stream and tributaries is to be charged under the compact; the definition of "rights which may now exist," which are to be included in charges to water apportioned by article III (a) and their magnitude on the main stream and tributaries; the date to which this last expression refers; whether, in the absence of a compact among the lower basin States, the division of water among them is to be affected by appropriate rights, i. e., rights which may now exist; whether Indian rights, and other Federal claims to consumptive use, are included within that expression and are to be charged under the compact; whether reservoir losses are chargeable as beneficial consumptive uses, and if so, their classification under the compact and their relation to other uses.

Questions relating primarily to article III (b) of the Colorado River compact include the following: The questions relating to the definition of "beneficial consumptive use" and "per annum" previously stated in connection with article III (a); whether the "increase of use" permitted to the lower basin by article III (b) is an apportionment in perpetuity as in article III (a), as Arizona contends, or a license to acquire rights by appropriation and contracts under the Project Act in excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the compact, as California contends; whether this right to increased use is identified solely with the water found flowing in the Gila River, as Arizona contends, or is identified with the first 1 million acre-feet of increased use (above 7,500,000) per annum throughout the lower basin, as California and Nevada contend; whether this right is available to all five States of the lower basin, or to Arizona alone, as she contends (notwithstanding the decision of this Court in *Arizona v. California et al.* (292 U. S. 341 (1934))); the status of uses in New Mexico on the Gila; the status of uses on other tributaries; and to what degree reservoir losses are chargeable to this increase of use. Reference to the relation of the Mexican Treaty burden to the uses under article III (b) appears below in connection with article III (c).

Questions relating primarily to article III (c) of the Colorado River compact include the following: Whether the waters to be supplied Mexico are "apportioned" thereby (this bears upon the determination of the meaning of the expression "excess or surplus waters unapportioned by" the Colorado River compact, appearing in the Boulder Canyon Project Act, *infra*); whether, if the quantities in excess of those specified in articles III (a) and III (b) are insufficient to supply the deliveries to Mexico, the burden, with respect to the lower basin, falls first upon the uses referred to in article III (b), as California contends, or upon those referred to in article III (a), as Arizona contends; and the relation of the escape clause in article 10 of the treaty, which permits reduction in deliveries to Mexico in case of extraordinary drought in proportion to the

reduction in consumptive uses in the United States. The relation of article III (c) to articles III (d) and III (a), with respect to the obligations of the upper division States, is referred to below in connection with article III (d).

Questions relating primarily to article III (d) of the Colorado River compact include the following: As a corollary to one of the questions stated with reference to article III (a), whether the 75 million acre-feet referred to in article III (d) is related to the 7,500,000 acre-feet apportioned by article III (a) to the lower basin, or whether the 75 million acre-feet include excess or surplus waters available for delivery to Mexico or use in the lower basin; the resulting effect on the obligation of the States of the upper division stated in article III (c) to furnish additional water to meet the deficiency if surplus above the quantities specified in articles III (a) and III (b) is insufficient to supply Mexico; and whether the lower basin is entitled to demand release of this 75 million acre-feet notwithstanding the consequent inability of the upper basin to make beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum.

Questions relating primarily to article III (e) of the Colorado River compact include the following: Whether, if excess or surplus waters are appropriated (or contracted for) in the lower basin, their release from storage in the upper basin may be required; whether, if Indian uses are not subject to the Colorado River compact, the United States may require release of water from reservoirs in the upper basin to satisfy them, in addition to the water which the States of the upper division are required to release in performance of articles III (c) and III (d) of the compact; so also with respect to the other Federal claims asserted by the United States "as against the parties to this cause," for use of water in the lower basin.

Questions relating primarily to articles III (f) and III (g) of the Colorado River compact include the following: Whether the provisions in these articles with reference to a compact to be made after October 1, 1963, are permissive or mandatory; whether, in the light of the statutory compact, these provisions preclude the acquisition of rights in excess or surplus waters by appropriation and by contract with the United States in the interim, subject only to further apportionment as between basins by such a future compact; and whether, in the event of competing interstate claims to such excess or surplus waters, in the absence of a compact apportioning them, priority of appropriation, including contracts with the United States, controls.

Questions relating to article VII of the Colorado River compact include the following: Whether uses by Indians are subject to the Colorado River compact; whether Indian uses are chargeable under the compact to the basin and the State in which they are situated; if not, whether they are prior and superior to the apportionments made by the compact, or are in competition with appropriations of others which are subject to the compact; the location, magnitude, and asserted priority of Indian claims; their effect upon the quantities available to non-Indian users under articles III (a), III (b), etc., their effect on the distribution of the Mexican Treaty burden; and their effect on the obligations of the States of the upper division under articles III (c) and III (d).

Questions relating primarily to article VIII of the Colorado River compact include the following: The date to which the expression "present perfected rights" relates, i. e., 1922, 1929, or some other date; the definition of said terms; whether such definition is to be determined under the law of the State under which the right arose; whether the assurance against impairment extends to quality as well as quantity; the

extent of these rights in each State; their relation to the expression "rights which may now exist," as used in article III (a) of the compact and section 4 (a) of the Project Act; and the impact of reservoir losses when present "perfected rights" attach to, and are satisfied from stored waters, pursuant to the direction in article VIII.

Questions relating primarily to the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the resulting statutory compact between the United States and California include the following: Whether the alternative consent given in the Project Act to a 7-State or 6-State compact became final on June 25, 1929, in establishing the latter; whether Arizona could, or did, effectively ratify a 7-State compact thereafter; if so, whether the statutory compact authorized by the Project Act as a corollary to a 6-State compact remains in effect; if it does, whether Arizona can claim the benefits of both; whether the statutory compact authorized contracts to be made with the California defendants for the permanent service (in addition to 4,400,000 acre-feet of III (a) waters) of one-half of the excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the compact for use in California; whether it included therein the waters referred to in article III (b), or precluded California from use of such waters; whether the "excess or surplus," of which California may use one-half, is to be reckoned before or after deduction of the quantity required to be delivered to Mexico; the effect on California's right to "excess or surplus" of a future compact apportioning such waters; whether the limitation "for use in California" is net of reservoir losses, or is subject to further reduction in consequence of such losses; whether the definition of consumptive uses applicable to California is applicable to Arizona, and vice versa; whether California is free to make use of salvaged waters without charge under the compact or the Limitation Act; the effect of California's appropriations; the meaning and effect of the reference to "rights which may now exist" in section 4 (a) of the Project Act; the extent of California's "present perfected rights" as referred to in section 6 of the Project Act; whether by the Project Act, or otherwise, the shares of Nevada or Arizona in the waters of the Colorado River system have been determined; and the construction and effect of the water delivery contracts held by those States.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, some who appeared at the hearings before the subcommittee endeavored to indicate their apprehension as to the economic feasibility of the project. Because I want Senators to have in mind the argument which has been made by some witnesses who appeared before the committee. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, also as a part of my remarks, a news story entitled "Colorado River Project Subsidy Dangers Told," which was published in the Los Angeles Times of July 15, 1954, being this is in great part, a reference to a statement by Mr. Samuel B. Morris, general manager and chief engineer of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO RIVER PROJECT SUBSIDY DANGERS TOLD

Federal handouts amounting to \$7,520 an acre for farmlands in the upper Colorado River storage project have been pointed out to the Senate committee holding hearings on the controversial reclamation plan, it was announced here yesterday by the Colorado River Association.

The new figure on the magnitude of concealed subsidies involved in the project bill was included in a statement presented to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee by Samuel B. Morris, general manager and chief engineer of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, the association said.

Morris is one of the southern California public utility authorities who are opposing the bill because it presents a serious threat to the Colorado River water and power supplies of this area.

"Taxpayers of the United States will have to pay \$782,393,000 for interest charges alone on just one of the so-called participating projects included in Senate bill 1555," Morris' report showed. He referred specifically to the proposed Shiprock irrigation project, in New Mexico, as a glaring example of the sin of concealed subsidies.

The United States Reclamation Bureau plans to spend \$178,825,000 of Federal funds to build an irrigation system to serve the project area which contains only 104,000 acres. By putting off until the year 2020 the start of any substantial repayments of the construction cost, the compound interest charges at 2½ percent over the long period of years add up to the \$782,393,000 figures cited, Morris said.

Morris said the process of filling proposed reservoirs in the upper portions of the Colorado River with 37 million acre-feet of water would take possibly 15 years. In that time the power output at Hoover Dam and other downstream plants might be reduced to 60 percent of normal. This would have a direct effect on power supplies for southern California and would also be reflected in impaired financial operations of Hoover Dam, now the outstanding example of a soundly financed Federal powerplant, Morris added.

Another objection, Morris said, is the refusal to take into account the probable effect of atomic energy on future power costs. Under the terms of the bill, power rates at Glen Canyon powerplant are set artificially high and its earnings are counted on to subsidize irrigation.

"This planned continuance of high power charges for 80 years in spite of the probable reduction in cost of power through atomic energy or other inventions seems indefensible because there may be no market for power at those rates," Morris said.

Mr. KUCHEL. I make no prepared argument today against any specific piece of legislation on this subject; none is before us. I make this statement merely by way of respectful reply to the comments on Saturday of my colleague from Utah.

Mr. President, I have conceived my responsibilities, during the time I have been a Member of the Senate, to be both to the people of the United States and to the people of the State of California.

It seems to me I have a right to say, speaking for the people of California, that that which is theirs by law or by agreement ought to remain theirs under the law or the agreement and it is my duty to see that their rights are respected. By the same token, speaking as a Member of the United States Senate, I want every State in the American Union to receive that to which it is justly entitled; and I wish to participate, along with my fellow Senators, in building up the economy and the resources of the United States, and in approving—in those instances where they can be found to be feasible and fair and in the public interest—projects which the Government of the United States can approve, and in the building of which it can par-

ticipate. That is the basis upon which I ask Senators to listen to the arguments pro and con with respect to the legislation upon which my friend from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] commented Saturday, and upon which I wish briefly to comment today.

I wish to make no argument on this occasion against the legislation to which my friend from Utah has previously adverted, but I do wish to keep the record straight. It was not upon the basis of any "vicious" desire to defeat any legislation in the present session of the Congress that the State of California asked the Supreme Court, by way of a motion, to bring in other parties to a lawsuit. I hope that in any future discussions we may have on the floor or in committee regarding this particular legislation, those of us from all the States which are involved in this controversy may be given credit among ourselves and by other Members of the Senate for acting in good faith, not alone in the best interests of our respective States, but also in the best interests of our country.

Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Tennessee in yielding to me, and I now yield back the floor.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7434) to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education. I ask unanimous consent to the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.
(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I take it that the Senator has not discussed this matter with the minority leader.

Mr. COOPER. I have been informed by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who was one of the conferees, that he consulted with the minority leader and that it is perfectly in order to consider the conference report at this time.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Kentucky has stated, I was one of the members of the conference committee which agreed on the report the Senator from Kentucky is asking the Senate to consider at this time. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was the other minority member of the conferees appointed on the part of the Senate. We both signed the report. We also advised distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] of the

report. He has no objection to them. Certainly we have no objection to them.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION — CONFERENCE RE- PORT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7601) to provide for a White House Conference on Education. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I believe the Senator from Kentucky will agree that the Senate conferees came out pretty well on these conference reports. I wonder whether the Senator would make a very brief statement relating to what was done in conference and how well the Senate conferees fared.

Mr. COOPER. On the conference report now before the Senate, the purpose of which is to provide for a White House Conference on Education, the conference agreed upon an authorization of a million dollars for that purpose. Previously the House had refused to make such an authorization. I believe the authorization adds a great deal to the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It was the Senate that added the authorization. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. It was thought by the Senate that for the Conference to be successful it would be necessary to make such an authorization. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. We thought so. Without it, we thought the Conference would not be held, and that the bill would have very little meaning. Now we believe that the States will hold conferences and that they will present their findings to the White House in a national conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDU- CATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of confer-

ence on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator make a brief statement about this conference report, and indicate how well the conferees on the part of the Senate fared in connection with this conference report?

Mr. COOPER. Although I do not consider these three bills to be major bills, I should state that in each instance after the conference the result was a much better bill. The conference report now under consideration authorizes cooperative research in education. It would establish a group consisting of nine persons to advise with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on national programs affecting education. The conference report bill would authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with various bodies for research on technical problems, which is something that has not been done thus far. I believe the three measures will enable the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a much broader program in the field of education. I cannot say what the immediate results will be, but at least it is the beginning of a program which should have results of consequence in this field.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief remark from me, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to express my appreciation for the work of the entire committee in connection with these bills, particularly the work done by the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

We went into the studies very carefully, and they were worked on with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. All the bills were recommended unanimously by our committee. Then when they were passed by the Senate and went to conference with the House, the conferees quickly arrived at an agreement on these bills. So I express my compliments to the chairman of the committee and my appreciation of the fact that the bills are being passed this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8571) to authorize the construction of naval vessels, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Members of the Senate may recall that H. R. 8571 authorized the construction of approximately 14,000 tons of naval vessels in the mine warfare and patrol categories. It also increased the appropriation authorization provided for in the basic Naval Construction Act of 1950 from \$350 million to \$500 million.

The Senate amended the bill by reducing the appropriation increase from \$500 million to \$450 million. The House agreed to Senate changes.

The Senate also amended the bill by inserting the following language:

To the extent that any ships authorized under this act are constructed in private shipyards, such contracts shall be awarded to the lowest competitive bidder insofar as national security requirements will permit and such award is practical.

The House conferees strongly held to the position that such language, by implication, set aside or amended the Armed Forces Procurement Act of 1947 and the so-called Vinson-Trammell Act.

The Senate conferees felt that it was quite clearly not the intent of the Senate language to amend or set aside existing law, and for that reason added to the Senate amendment language which specified that contracts authorized under the act should not be inconsistent with either the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 or the Vinson-Trammell Act.

In effect, therefore, the Senate language remains as it was with the following phrase added at the end of the sentence: "and is not inconsistent with the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 or the Act of March 27, 1934 (ch. 95, 48 Stat. 503), as amended."

With that amendment added, the House accepted the Senate language, and the conference report was unanimously adopted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. What is the effect of the amendment dealing with the Procurement Act?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered and there was agreed to an amendment providing for the acceptance of the lowest competitive bid, which we agreed

to take to conference and insist upon if it was practical. The amendment which the conferees agreed upon provides that bidding shall be consistent with the Vinson-Trammell Act, which, as we know, is the Naval Procurement Act.

Mr. HILL. Does that mean there does not have to be competitive bidding?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is competitive bidding, but the Vinson-Trammell Act allows 16 exceptions to the provision for letting the contract to the lowest competitive bidder, after certain decisions are made that a straight competitive bid would be impracticable.

Mr. HILL. When the Senator states that 16 exceptions are made, does he mean there are 16 different phases of a contract?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; there are 16 different situations, any one of which might arise to make it difficult to have straight competitive bidding. The original law was the act of 1935, which was prepared with a great deal of care by Representative Vinson, who was at that time Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator advise us as to one of the 16 exceptions, merely as an illustration?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The clearest example would be a contract involving the construction of a new type ship which had never been built before, or a new naval airplane of a type never built before.

Mr. HILL. The new ship might have certain features which had never been embodied in other ships, such as different engines, or new armament, or a difference in the construction of the deck. In other words, the construction might be in the nature of a somewhat new enterprise. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to revise and strengthen the present Federal regulation of the Lobbying Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill (S. 3775) to amend the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on June 7, 1954, the United States Supreme Court in a split decision upheld the constitutionality of the present Lobbying Act. But it did so only with some difficulty, requiring a majority opinion which narrowly interpreted or "rewrote" many provisions of the act, and a minority opinion which strongly criticized the language or constitutionality of other provisions. Upon the announcement of this decision, as they had done many times previously, the Nation's press and

other expert observers insisted that the present Regulation of Lobbying Act be drastically revised. It is, of course, impossible to give this problem the attention it deserves in the closing hectic days of Congress; but I am introducing this bill at this time in the hope that it will receive thorough analysis and criticism from experts and all concerned before the 84th Congress convenes.

The bill which I have introduced today represents the work of many committee, governmental, and private specialists over a period of time prior to the Court decision, and in addition has attempted to meet the objections raised by the opinion of the Supreme Court. Recommendations of the House Select Committee on Lobbying were also helpful.

This bill contains the following major improvements:

First. Enforcement: A copy of all registration and reporting documents would go to the Attorney General, who is charged with the responsibility for the enforcement of the act. The use of more precise terms, the expansion of such definitions as "legislative agent" and extension of the terms of the act to make certain that it is not evaded by those at whom it is aimed, will, I hope, facilitate its enforcement and thereby augment its significance on the national legislative scene.

Second. Constitutionality: Items of dubious constitutionality, including those which had to be stretched by the Supreme Court in order to prevent infringement of free speech, and those which the Supreme Court had to "rewrite," according to some, in order to make sufficiently clear to meet the standards of certainty, have been eliminated or rewritten under this bill. The coverage of "indirect" lobbying is omitted; the prohibition of any lobbying either after a conviction or prior to registration is omitted; radio and TV stations are added to newspapers and regularly published periodicals under the exemption clause; and other provisions seek to remove constitutional objections to the law and thus facilitate its administration.

Third. Contingent fees: This bill seeks for the first time to prohibit contingent fee lobbying contracts, whereby the compensation of lobbyists is dependent upon their "success" in securing the passage or defeat of particular measures. This practice, which is a serious reflection upon the legislative process and those who seek to influence it, is already outlawed under the lobby control laws of many States; and such a provision was recommended by the Buchanan committee and others.

Fourth. Draftsmanship: This bill attempts to meet criticisms of the language of the old law by rewriting it in what, in my opinion, is clear, more comprehensive, more consistent, better integrated, more practical and more up-to-date terminology. Those definitions which have been termed "loose" are made clearer and more concise, and other definitions have been added in order to clarify the intent of the law. Reporting or coverage requirements concerning the amount of contributions or expenditures under the act are set at levels which bal-

ance practicality with adequacy of coverage. The word "regulation" is removed from the title, to reemphasize the point that no stigma should be attached to those registering under the act. Internal conflicts and confusion have been eliminated.

I have introduced this bill at this time in the hope that before Congress meets again it will receive the careful consideration and constructive criticism of other Members of Congress and the public. Certainly if we are to be worthy of the trust confided in us, we must make certain that we neither impair the right of petition nor permit abuses and undisclosed pressures to interfere with the legislative process.

I am glad that the Senator from Oklahoma is on the floor, because he played a major part in writing the provisions of this act into the Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to compliment the junior Senator from Massachusetts for his diligence and effort to place the proposed act before the country for study. In writing the Reorganization Act we recognized the difficulty of defining lobbying activities and activities associated with lobbying, particularly when it is necessary to connect up efforts for hire, so to speak, to influence legislation in Congress with a penalty clause which would carry an enforcement provision under which a jail term could be imposed for failure to register or to file reports. Therefore, I am delighted to note the thoroughness and energy with which the junior Senator from Massachusetts has endeavored to meet and correct this need.

It will certainly be very helpful to have the bill before the country to permit ample discussion and to project hearings when the 84th session of Congress opens.

One of the defects of the Lobbying Act was due to the fact that it was made a part of the Reorganization Act, which embodied approximately 34 reforms of a somewhat major nature, and to have complete and exhaustive testimony on that one phase was not possible within the limited time which was available, and therefore Congress passed it largely in the hope that it would be refined.

The act has been on the books since 1946. Certainly in that period of time, and now with the decision of the Supreme Court as a guidepost as to what provisions might be incorporated in it to make such a law effective, the introduction of the bill by the junior Senator from Massachusetts will prove to be a very distinct advantage. Particularly is it necessary, in connection with big lobbying activities, not to prevent the activities themselves, but to identify the sources and pressures, and the sources of the amounts of money which are spent in influencing proposed legislation. The public should have the truth. We have a right to expect the truth to be forthcoming. In that way I believe we can have a successful identification and a placing of certain limits on excessive lobbying or excessive pressures on Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma particularly be-

cause he was a coauthor of the Reorganization Act. I am aware what a difficult problem Congress was confronted with in 1946. The 8 years of experience we have had with the act and the recent Supreme Court decision may well assert their influence on the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations when it considers this entire problem.

As the Senator has suggested, the problem of coordinating lobbying regulations with a desire to preserve the right of citizens to petition Congress is a very difficult and delicate operation. I believe that the 8 years of experience we have had under that section of the Reorganization Act since 1946 should prove beneficial in considering it at the beginning of the next Congress.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1061. A bill for the relief of Norman F. George (Rept. No. 1914);

S. 3305. A bill to authorize payment of certain war claims, including payment of certain claims arising out of the sequestration by the Imperial Japanese Government of credits of members of the military and naval forces of the United States and other United States nationals in the Philippines (Rept. No. 1915);

H. R. 1975. A bill to amend section 2201 of title 28, United States Code, to extend the Federal Declaratory Judgments Act to the Territory of Alaska (Rept. No. 1916);

H. R. 1976. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit the registration of judgments in or from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska (Rept. No. 1917);

H. R. 3557. A bill for the relief of Capt. Walter C. Wolf (Rept. No. 1918);

H. R. 3757. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson (Rept. No. 1919);

H. R. 7140. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Duval (Rept. No. 1920); and

H. R. 7411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel (Rept. No. 1921).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 417. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande (Rept. No. 1922);

S. 1737. A bill for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation (Rept. No. 1923);

S. 3166. A bill for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho (Rept. No. 1924);

S. 3214. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Monchen (Rept. No. 1925);

S. 3293. A bill for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson (Rept. No. 1926);

H. R. 1370. A bill for the relief of Guy H. Davant (Rept. No. 1927);

H. R. 2032. A bill for the relief of Clarence D. Newland (Rept. No. 1928);

H. R. 3222. A bill for the relief of Martin Luther Johnson (Rept. No. 1929);

H. R. 4474. A bill for the relief of Frederick Joseph Buttaccio and others (Rept. No. 1930); and

H. R. 4638. A bill for the relief of David W. Wallace (Rept. No. 1931).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2496. A bill for the relief of Harvey Schwartz (Rept. No. 1932);

19. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment S. 2786, consenting to the Southeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact (pp. 10314-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.
Passed without amendment H. R. 6393, consenting to a South Central Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact (pp. 10315-6).
Passed without amendment H. R. 7912, to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and return the land to national forest status (p. 10318).
20. FARM LOANS. Passed as reported S. 3487, to authorize the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives to issue consolidated debentures (p. 10321).
Passed as reported H. R. 7568, to direct the Farm Loan Board of Hawaii to convey certain land and to ratify and confirm certain contracts (p. 10318).
21. CCC BORROWING POWER. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9756, to increase the CCC borrowing power by \$1½ billion (H. Rept. 2269)(p. 10413). The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of this bill (p. 10414).
22. WATER FACILITIES LOANS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment S. 3137, to amend the Water Facilities Act (H. Rept. 2290)(p. 10414). For provisions of this bill see Digest 130.
23. PERFORMANCE RATINGS. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported on its study of performance ratings for Federal employees (H. Rept. 2277)(p. 10413).
24. RECLAMATION. Received the conference report on H. R. 4854, to authorize the Foster Creek division of Chief Joseph Dam project, Wash. (H. Rept. 2274) (p. 10306).
Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. R. 6786, authorizing Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on U. S. public lands in the Palisades project area (p. 10307). This bill will now be sent to the President.
Rep. Hosmer spoke against certain bills which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct and operate the Colorado River storage project (pp. 10325-6).
25. DROUGHT RELIEF. Rep. Edmondson urged immediate relief for drought stricken areas (pp. 10326-7).
26. MINERALS; PUBLIC LANDS. Passed with amendment S. 3344, to amend the mineral leasing laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands (pp. 10342-355).
27. VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION. Received the conference report on S. 2759, to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services (H. Rept. 2286) (pp. 10386-92).
28. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6310, to exempt from regulation by the CAB, operations in the transportation of livestock, fish, floricultural, and horticultural commodities (H. Rept. 2281) (p. 10413).

29. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment S. 3589, to provide for the independent management of the Export-Import Bank under a Board of Directors, to provide for representation of the bank on the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and to increase the bank's lending authority (H. Rept. 2270) (p. 10413). The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of this bill (p. 10414).
30. VETERANS' BENEFITS. The Veterans' Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 9888, to amend the laws granting education and training benefits to certain veterans to extend the period during which such benefits may be offered (H. Rept. 2279) (p. 10413).
31. FLOOD CONTROL. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 9859, the omnibus flood control bill (p. 10414).
32. EDUCATION. Received conference report on H. R. 9040, to authorize cooperative research in education (H. Rept. 2287) and H. R. 7434, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education (H. Rept. 2289) (pp. 10392-3).

SENATE (cont'd)

33. APPROPRIATIONS. S. Doc. 140 (July 14) is a supplemental appropriation estimate for the Health, Education, and Welfare Department including the following items: Food and Drug Administration, a provision whereby collection of inspection fees with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities would make the services provided largely self-supporting; Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, \$6,000,000 for grants to States, \$1,831,000 for training of personnel, and \$400,000 for administrative expenses for an immediate expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program; Social Security Administration, increase in trust fund limitation from \$64,400,000 to \$79,000,000 to meet the increased workload which will result from expansion of the old-age and survivors insurance program; Federal Health Reinsurance Service, \$25,000,000 for making payments to the capital-advance fund to be established for advances to the Health Service Prepayment Plan Reinsurance Fund, and \$325,000 for expenses for handling the administration of the Federal Health Reinsurance Service and for technical, advisory, and information services to carriers and other sponsors of health service prepayment plans, and to the general public. The Bureau of the Budget letter states "It is proposed to establish the Federal Health Reinsurance Service as a separate constituent organization of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This Service will consist of a Director's office, a Bureau of Health Reinsurance, and Bureau of Technical and Advisory Service."

S. Doc. 137 (July 14) is a supplemental appropriation estimate for the Labor Department and includes the following items: Bureau of Employment Security, \$25,000,000 for unemployment compensation payments to Federal employees, \$3,756,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, and \$300,000 for salaries and expenses to enable the performance of Federal administrative duties.

S. Doc. 135 (July 13) is a supplemental appropriation estimate for the Interior Department and includes the following items: Bureau of Reclamation, \$875,000 to carry out general investigations work on selected reclamation projects, and \$5,963,000 to permit the initiation of construction work on 3 new projects (including the Glendo unit, Wyo.) and additional work on 4 going projects.

funds out of any year's Federal appropriations will never fall below its "base allotment," but adopts the matching provisions of the Senate bill. Under these matching provisions, for a 5-year period each State's Federal-State matching ratio on the portion of its allotment equal to its "base allotment" will be the same as its Federal-State matching ratio in 1954. Over the next 3 years (fiscal 1960, 1961, and 1962) this ratio will be adjusted gradually upward and downward, 25 percent a year, to the Federal-State matching ratio that applies to the portion of its allotment which exceeds its 1954 or "base allotment." During and after fiscal 1963 each State will have a single Federal-State matching ratio computed in the manner described below which will apply to its entire allotment of Federal funds for any year.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment based their new formulas for Federal-State matching of funds in excess of the base allotments on the matching formula in the Hill-Buton Hospital Survey and Construction Act, under which the Federal-State matching ratios varied inversely with the per capita income of each State. Under the Senate bill the Federal ratio in a State with a per capita income exactly equal to the national per capita income would have been 55 percent; that is, 55 percent Federal and 45 percent State. Under the House amendment, the Federal share in such a State would have been 62 percent (62 percent Federal and 38 percent State). The conference substitute provides for a Federal share of 60 percent in the State whose per capita income exactly equals the national per capita income. As under both the Senate bill and House amendment, the maximum and minimum Federal shares are 10 percent above and below the Federal share of the 60 percent State, resulting in a maximum of 70 percent and a minimum of 50 percent.

In all other respects the conference substitute follows the allotment and matching provisions in the House amendment in the case of section 2 grants.

GRANTS FOR EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided that from sums available in any fiscal year for such purposes, grants would be made to States to assist them in initiating projects for the extension and improvement of their vocational rehabilitation services each State being entitled to an allotment based on population, but not less than \$5,000 for any one State. However, the Senate bill provided that payments with respect to any such project would be equal to 75 percent of the cost of the project for the first biennium, 50 percent of the cost for the second biennium, and 25 percent of the cost for the third biennium, whereas the House amendment provided that payments with respect to any such project would be equal to 75 percent of the cost of the project for a period not to exceed 2 years. The conference agreement provides that payments with respect to such projects shall be equal to 75 percent of the cost of the project for a period of not to exceed 3 years.

PILOT DEMONSTRATION REHABILITATION CENTER

The Senate bill contained a provision, not included in the House amendment, authorizing the Secretary to cooperate in assisting with the financing of a pilot demonstration rehabilitation center in the metropolitan Washington area. It was provided that sums made available for the center could not exceed \$1,000,000 a year. This provision is retained in the conference substitute, with one change. The change deletes the provision that sums made available for the center could not exceed \$1,000,000 a year, and inserts in lieu thereof a provision that sums

made available for the center may be used during such initial period as the Secretary may determine. The inclusion of specific authority for this project is not intended to imply that the Secretary lacks authority to grant similar assistance for comparable projects located in other areas.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The Senate bill established a National Advisory Council on Vocational Rehabilitation to advise the Secretary in connection with special projects under the act. The Council would consist of the Secretary and 12 members appointed by the Secretary from among leaders in fields concerned with vocational rehabilitation or in public affairs, 6 of whom would be required to be leading medical, educational, or scientific authorities who are outstanding for their work in the vocational rehabilitation of handicapped individuals. Three of the twelve would be required to be persons who are themselves physically handicapped.

The House amendment contained no corresponding provision.

The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill establishing the Advisory Council.

It is the desire of the conferees that in making appointments to the Advisory Council the Secretary should give appropriate recognition to representatives of both labor and management.

TRAINING OF PERSONNEL

The Senate bill, in section 4 (a), provided that among the purposes for which special project grants might be made is that of paying part of the cost of training and traineeships. The Senate bill also provided, in section 8 (a) (3), that the Secretary should provide such short-term training and instruction in technical matters relating to vocational rehabilitation services, including the establishment and maintenance of such research fellowships and traineeships, as he might deem necessary. In both instances the House amendment limited this authority so that it could not be exercised after June 30, 1956. The House amendment further limited such authority by providing that no special project grant could be made for the purpose of providing training or traineeship for any individual for a period exceeding 12 months, and that the Secretary could not provide an individual any training or instruction (or fellowship or scholarship) for a period in excess of 1 year. The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill, except that under it no training, traineeship, or instruction (or fellowship or scholarship) could be provided any individual for any one course of study extending for a period in excess of 2 years.

UTILIZATION OF EXISTING STATE AGENCIES

The Senate bill provided that to be approvable a State plan must provide, among other things, for cooperation by the State agency with, and the utilization of the services of, the State agency administering the State's public assistance program, the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and of other Federal, State, and local agencies providing services relating to vocational rehabilitation services. The House amendment required that the plan provide for cooperation with those agencies, including the State workmen's compensation agency, and that it provide for utilization of the services of such agencies insofar as practicable.

The conference agreement adopts the Senate provisions because of the stronger language relating to the utilization of other agencies. The omission of reference to the State workmen's compensation agency should not be construed as showing an intention on the part of the conferees to preclude co-

operation with and the utilization of this agency. The conferees believe that the general language of the Senate provision adequately covers this agency to the extent that it provides services relating to vocational rehabilitation and that specific reference to it is unnecessary.

CAPITAL ADVANCES FOR VENDING STAND OPERATORS

The House amendment provided in the definition of "vocational rehabilitation services" for the advancing of working capital, in amounts not to exceed \$500, to licensed vending stand operators. No comparable provision was included in the Senate bill. The House recedes.

TRANSFER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REHABILITATION PROGRAM TO DISTRICT GOVERNMENT

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided for the transfer, within 90 days following enactment of the bill, of the District of Columbia vocational rehabilitation program from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (which now operates it) to the municipal government of the District of Columbia. The conference substitute contains similar provisions but with perfecting amendments designed to clarify the application of the base allotment and matching provisions to the District, and to assure the uninterrupted operation of the program by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare during the interim period of 90 days or less, between the enactment of the bill and the completion of the transfer arrangements.

AMENDMENTS TO RANDOLPH-SHEPPARD ACT

The House amendment contained extensive amendments to the Randolph-Sheppard Act for the purpose of providing blind persons with remunerative employment, enlarging the economic opportunities of the blind, and generally improving the vending stand programs in the States. An amendment in the Senate bill provided that preference for the installation and/or operation of vending machines within Federal buildings should be given to blind operators of vending stands within such buildings.

The Senate accepted the House amendments to the Randolph-Sheppard Act, with the exception of one which provided that if any funds are set aside from the proceeds of the operation of the vending stands for the purpose of assuring a fair minimum return to operators of vending stands, such funds could be used for this purpose only for a period of not to exceed 1 year following (1) the date of approval of the State's application submitted under the bill, or (2) the initial establishment of the stand, whichever occurs later. With respect to this amendment the conference agreement provided that if funds are set aside for the purpose of assuring a fair minimum return to operators of vending stands, no time limits with respect to the use of the funds should be imposed.

HOMEBOUND HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS

The House amended the Senate bill so as to provide for an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1955, and \$2,000,000 annually thereafter, to be used for making grants, upon recommendation of the State agency, to local school boards and local nonprofit educational groups providing special services to the handicapped, for the purpose of providing general ameliorative and vocational training to handicapped persons, commonly known as shut-ins, whose disabilities confine them to their homes or beds. At least 20 percent of the grants would be required to be made in rural areas.

In lieu of this provision, the conference agreement, in section 7, provides for a study to be made of existing programs for teaching and training these individuals, for the purpose of ascertaining whether additional or supplementary programs or services are nec-

essary, particularly in rural areas, in order to provide general ameliorative and vocational training to these persons. The Secretary is required to report to the Congress within 6 months after date of enactment of the bill the results of the study, together with any appropriate recommendations.

WORKSHOPS

Another subject which was discussed by the conference committee was the definition of the term "workshop." The committee was in agreement that the workshops to be aided under the bill are those which are operated principally as facilities for preparing handicapped persons for employment in the competitive labor market, or for providing interim remunerative employment for handicapped individuals for whom no other employment opportunities in the competitive labor market exist. In other words, the type of workshop that would qualify under the bill is a shop in which severely handicapped individuals who cannot be readily absorbed into the competitive labor market are given remunerative employment as an interim step in the rehabilitation process, or which provide remunerative employment for severely handicapped individuals during such time as employment opportunities in the competitive labor market do not exist.

SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, Jr.,
RALPH GWINN,
WINT SMITH,
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2287)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That (a) in order to enable the Office of Education more effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.

"(b) No contract or jointly financed cooperative arrangement shall be entered into under this section until the Commissioner of Education has obtained the advice and recommendations of educational research specialists who are competent to evaluate the proposals as to the soundness of their design, the possibilities of securing productive results, the adequacy of resources to conduct the proposed research, surveys, or demonstrations, and their relationship to other similar educational research already completed or in process.

"(c) The Commissioner of Education shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the research, surveys, and demonstrations initiated under this Act, the recommendations made by research special-

ists pursuant to subsection (b), and any action taken with respect to such recommendations.

"Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, Jr.,
RALPH GWINN,
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
ROBERT W. UPTON,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
LISTER HILL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted new provisions which differ from the House bill in some respects.

In the first section the Senate amendment provided that the Commissioner of Education could enter into contracts or arrangements with public and other nonprofit colleges and universities. The conference agreement omits the requirement that the college or university be a public or nonprofit one.

The Senate amendment also added to the House bill a requirement that the Commissioner of Education, before entering into any contract or arrangement under the Act for research, surveys, or demonstrations in the field of education, must obtain the advice and recommendations of educational-research specialists. It also requires that the Commissioner of Education report annually to the Congress with respect to operations under the Act. The conference substitute retains these provisions.

The Senate amendment added a new section to the House bill, which authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act. The provision is retained in the substitute agreed upon in conference.

SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, Jr.,
RALPH GWINN,
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7601) to provide for a White House conference on education:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2288)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7601) to provide for a White House Conference on Education, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 4 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "city of Washington, District of Columbia, before November 30, 1955, a conference broadly representative of educators and other citizens from all parts of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 2. (a) To assist each State to bring together, prior to the White House Conference on Education, educators and other interested citizens to discuss educational problems in the State and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken at local, State, and Federal levels, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be allotted to the States on the basis of their respective populations according to the latest figures certified by the Department of Commerce, except that no State's allotment shall be less than \$15,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, Jr.,
RALPH GWINN,
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
ROBERT W. UPTON,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
LISTER HILL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7601) to provide for a White House Conference on Education, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill authorized appropriations to enable the President to hold in the City of Washington, District of Columbia, a conference of educators and "interested laymen" from all parts of the nation to be called the White House Conference on Education, to consider and report to the President on significant and pressing problems in the field of education before November 30, 1955. The Senate amendment provided that the President hold in the City of Washington, District of Columbia, before November 30, 1955, a conference broadly representative of educators and "lay citizens" from all parts of the nation to be called the White House Conference on Education. The substitute provides that the conference be broadly representative of educators and "other interested citizens" from all parts of the nation.

Amendment No. 2: The Senate amendment places the words "before November 30, 1955" directly after the words "City of Washington, District of Columbia" rather than at the end of the paragraph as it appeared in the House bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The House bill provided that each State be requested to bring together, prior to the White House Conference on Education, educators and interested citizens to discuss educational problems in the State and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken at local, State and Federal levels, and that each State be requested to make a report of the findings and recommendations of the State conference for use of the White House Conference on Education. The Senate amendment

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 22, 1954
For actions of July 21, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 137

CONTENTS

Atomic energy.....14	Government competition.....5	Prices, support.....16
CCC.....1	Lands, public.....8	Property.....13
Conservation.....22	reclamation.10,18,21,25	REA.....24
Dairy products.....16	transfer.....11	Reports.....13
Education.....7	Loans, farm.....4,24	Research.....24
Electrification.....14,24	Minerals.....8	Soil conservation....22,24
Export-Import Bank.....3	Nominations.....15	Tariffs.....17
Extension work.....24	Organization, exec.....27	Taxation.....13
Farm program.....16,24	Patents.....12	Tobacco.....17
Flood control.....2	Personnel.....19,26	TVA.....14,20
Foreign aid.....23	Postal rates.....6	Water facilities loans...4
Forestry.....9		Water resources.....18

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to debate bill to increase CCC borrowing authority. House agreed to debate omnibus flood control bill. House Rules Committee cleared water-facilities loans bill. House defeated bill to increase postal pay and rates. Conferees agreed on tax revision bill.

HOUSE

1. CCC BORROWING POWER. Agreed to a resolution for consideration of H. R. 9756, to increase the borrowing power of CCC by \$1 $\frac{1}{2}$ billion additional (pp. 10683-4).
2. FLOOD CONTROL. Agreed to a resolution for consideration of H. R. 9859, the omnibus flood control bill, which includes a \$20,000,000 authorization for this Department (p. 10682).
3. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK. Agreed to a resolution for consideration of S. 3589, to provide for independent management of the Export-Import Bank (pp. 10684-5).
4. WATER FACILITIES LOANS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 3137, to liberalize the Water Facilities Act (p. 10696).
5. GOVERNMENT COMPETITION. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment H. R. 9835, to provide for termination of Government operations which are in competition with private enterprise (H. Rept. 2441)(p. 10696).
6. POSTAL RATES AND PAY. By a vote of 228 to 171, rejected a motion to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 9245, to increase postal rates and the pay of postal

employees (pp. 10654-71). (Although a majority voted in favor of the bill, a two-thirds majority was necessary, because the bill was brought up under a motion to suspend the rules instead of being first cleared with the Rules Committee.)

It was announced that a sufficient number of signatures have been obtained on a motion to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of a bill to increase postal pay by a larger amount than provided in H. R. 9245 and to make no change in postal rates (pp. 10694-5).

7. EDUCATION. Passed without amendment, 399-0, H. R. 9888, extending the time for initiating training under the Korean GI bill of rights for 1 year (pp. 10637-42).

Agreed to the conference reports on H. R. 9040, to authorize cooperative research in education, and H. R. 7434, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education (p. 10678). These bills will now be sent to the President.

8. PUBLIC LANDS; MINERALS. Passed without amendment S. 2380 and S. 2381, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act in order to promote development of oil and gas on the public domain (p. 10674).

House conferees were appointed on S. 3344, to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of public lands (p. 10676). Senate conferees have been appointed.

9. FORESTRY. Requested the Senate to return H. R. 6393, approving a forest fire compact, for correction of the bill number (p. 10637).

10. RECLAMATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4854, to authorize the Foster Creek division, Wash. (p. 10676). This bill will now be sent to the President.

The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 8384, to authorize the Talent division, Oreg. (p. 10695).

11. LAND TRANSFER. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. J. Res. 550, to release reversionary rights to a tract of former FHA land in Kern County, Calif. (H. Rept. 2428)(p. 10695).

12. PATENTS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3534, to authorize extension of patents in certain situations (pp. 10695-6).

SENATE

13. PROPERTY; TAXATION; REPORTS. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 5605, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to provide that transfers of real property from certain Government corporations to other Government agencies shall not operate to remove such property from local tax rolls (S. Rept. 1966); and H. R. 6290, to discontinue various requirements for reports to Congress, etc. (S. Rept. 1968)(p. 10700).

14. ATOMIC ENERGY. Continued debate on S. 3690, to amend the Atomic Energy Act (pp. 10707, 10715-55, 10758-88).

Agreed to a modified Ferguson amendment providing that authority of AEC to enter into contracts or modify or confirm existing contracts for electric power includes, in case such service is to be furnished to AEC by TVA, authority to contract with any person to furnish such power to TVA in replacement thereof, and requiring any contract hereafter entered into by AEC to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy 30 days before becoming effective. Agreed, 56-35, to Sen. Knowland's motion to lay on the table a motion to reconsider this vote. (pp. 10771-2.)

in grade recommended by the Board would have been effected forthwith by the Secretary of the Navy. No advancements to grades higher than captain or colonel were authorized. The pay and allowances of an officer who was advanced would have been based upon the grade or rank to which advanced and would have been computed from the date when he would have been advanced in normal course but for the error, administrative delay, oversight, or injustice which caused him to fall of advancement.

Section 2 of the amendment, in effect, would have authorized the promotion to the grade of captain of two retired commanders, United States Navy, who met either of two detailed sets of qualifications, and would have given them, retroactively, pay and allowances based on the grade of captain, computed from the date the officers next junior to them were promoted to captain.

The Senate receded from its amendment to the House bill.

The House managers were of the opinion that the Senate amendment, if enacted into law, would establish a precedent which might well impugn the integrity of the entire Navy and Marine Corps promotion system. While the amendment applied only to the panel system which operated during World War II, it might well be used as a basis for seeking similar reviews for officers who have failed or will fall of selection under the 1947 Officer Personnel Act.

The amendment would also have automatically promoted two officers who failed of promotion during World War II.

The House managers can find no present justification for the enactment of legislation which by its terms would result in the automatic promotion of two officers to the grade of captain with pay retroactive to the date that officers junior to them were promoted to the grade of captain. Such action would of course establish a precedent for many similar bills thus creating a review system in the Congress which could only have the effect of undermining the objectivity and finality of the promotion systems established for each of the armed services. To overcome this objection, there must be clear, undisputed evidence of substantial error and injustice.

L. C. ARENDS,
PAUL W. SHAFER,
LEROY JOHNSON,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE, UNITED STATES ARMY RETIRED TO CIVILIAN POSITION

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9804) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U. S. C. 62), or any other provision of law, Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, may be appointed to and accept and

hold a civilian position in the Department of Justice.

SEC. 2. Major General Partridge's appointment to, and acceptance and holding of, a civilian position in the Department of Justice shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold as a retired officer in the United States Army, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided, however,* That during his incumbency in a civilian position in the Department of Justice he shall receive the compensation appertaining to such position in lieu of the retired pay to which he is entitled as a retired officer of the Army: *Provided, further,* That upon the termination of such civilian employment the payment of his retired pay shall be resumed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8571) to authorize the construction of naval vessels, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 19, 1954.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF CANDIDATES FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 439) providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1955, with respect to the following matters:

1. The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

2. The amounts subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including per-

sonal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobile and other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1954 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

3. The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

4. The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

5. The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, Public Law 101, 80th Congress, chapter 120, first session, referred to as the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

6. Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1954, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

7. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before and duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 83d Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any

member designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

8. The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

9. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1955, as hereinabove provided.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half the time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would provide for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 439 is the usual resolution that we adopt in an election year and as a matter of fact the language of the resolution before us today is identical with the language contained in House Resolution 558 of the 82d Congress.

At that time a rather full discussion of the merits of the wording of this resolution took place, and it was generally conceded that as long as the spirit and intent implicit in this resolution was wisely recognized and followed that the provisions contained in it were satisfactory.

I hope that the House will adopt the resolution and thus provide for the appointment of this special committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution that is passed in every election year and we have to do it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, however regrettable it may be, I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] that we have to do it. It is the usual thing. There is no use pursuing the matter any further.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS OF 1954

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2759) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of

vocational rehabilitation services, provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and otherwise improve the provisions of that act, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House July 19, 1954.)

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following telegram from a constituent:

Hon. JAMES TRIMBLE,
Member of Congress:

Request legislative remarks from floor of Congress indicating that the omission of phrase "corrective therapy" from Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments, S. 2759, H. R. 9640, does not imply exclusion of our specialty as an available integral and diametric discipline essential in total physical rehabilitation.

WM. R. HORNSBY.

900 VANDEVENTER, FAYETTEVILLE, ARK.

I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] if this legislation takes care of the request of Mr. Hornsby.

Mr. McCONNELL. The omission of the phrase "corrective therapy" from the bill amending the Vocational Rehabilitation Act does not imply an exclusion of that type of physical rehabilitation treatment specialty. It is the intent of the bill, as I understand it, for those in charge of the program to have available various types of treatment for use in physical-rehabilitation activities.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9040) to authorize cooperative research in education, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 19.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7601) to provide for a White House Conference on Education, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 19.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7434) to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 19.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JURISDICTION OF THE DISTRICT COURTS IN SUITS TO RECOVER TAXES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 252) to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 19, 1954.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Public Law 531 - 83d Congress
Chapter 576 - 2d Session
H. R. 9040

AN ACT

All 68 Stat. 533.

To authorize cooperative research in education.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to enable the Office of Education more effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education. Educational research.
Cooperative arrangements, etc.

(b) No contract or jointly financed cooperative arrangement shall be entered into under this section until the Commissioner of Education has obtained the advice and recommendations of educational research specialists who are competent to evaluate the proposals as to the soundness of their design, the possibilities of securing productive results, the adequacy of resources to conduct the proposed research, surveys, or demonstrations, and their relationship to other similar educational research already completed or in process. Advice of specialists.

(c) The Commissioner of Education shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the research, surveys, and demonstrations initiated under this Act, the recommendations made by research specialists pursuant to subsection (b), and any action taken with respect to such recommendations. Report to Congress.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Appropriation.

Approved July 26, 1954.

